DOCTOR OF EDUCATION (EDD)

An analysis of schools from the perspective of teachers' affective-emotional zones

Bryan-Zaykov, Christian

Award date:
2012

Awarding institution:
University of Bath

An analysis of schools from the perspective of teachers' affective-emotional zones

Christian Bryan-Zaykov

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Education

University of Bath
Department of Education

March 2012

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the hard work of Professor Chris James of the University of Bath and Mrs Gill Brooke-Taylor for her support. I would also like acknowledge my wife Tatiana and dedicate my work on this enquiry to her and our son, Fyodor.

Abstract

An ecological approach to space allows human constructs to become the primary prism through which to view workplaces (Nespor, 2000; Urry, 2005; Murdoch 2006). Human beings create meaning in their environments via the unity of symbolic actions and generalized meaning fields that gain their social usefulness via their affective tone. The resulting personal system becomes projected onto the world via the personal arrangement of things that are important for each person (Valsiner, 2000; Valsiner, 2005). Consequently, individual human beings constantly order parts in their environments through an affective-emotional lens when they encounter ideas, objects and spaces (Hochschild, 2003; Thrift, 2008; Boys, 2011). I use the *emotional labour* (Hochschild, 1983) concepts of display rules (expectations for emotional display) and feeling rules (expectations for internal affect) together with an ecological approach to space to investigate the existence of affective-emotional zones in schools. My research questions were: How do participants in a school make sense of their work environment through the lens of affective-emotional zones? How are affective-emotional zones characterized in terms of display rules and feeling rules? What challenges do teachers face when they are in particular affective-emotional zones and why? I broadly utilized a case study approach with a European international school to interview six experienced teachers using an active interview technique with open coding (Strauss and Corbin, 1998) and critical event coding (Webster and Mertova, 2007) as the principle methods of analysis. I was able to label and describe four zones that I argued are products of teacher rituals, habits, feelings (feeling rules) and emotions (display rules); the communal zone, the school zone, the student zone and the teacher zone. I further the notion of heretical feelings and emotions and describe how they constitute elements of the teacher condition. I found school affective-emotional zones are temporal as school spaces have the potential to shift from one affective-emotional zone to another as a consequence of time changes in the school day. I outline questions for future research based on my findings.

Table of Contents

Chapter

Declaration of authenticity for doctoral theses

I hereby declare that this thesis, submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, contains no material previously published or written in any medium by another person, except where appropriate reference has been made.

Chapter 1 - Introduction

Feelings and emotions influence modern workplaces through norms and expectations, social structures and moral discourses and can be regarded as constitutive of organizational life because they are constitutive of all human experience (Damasio, 2000; Armstrong, 2007; Fineman, 2008). Consequently the worker is transformed into a sentient, feeling self whereby the person is constantly engaged in asking self-referencing questions as an everyday work-related task.

Moreover, human beings create meaning via the unity of symbolic actions and generalized meaning fields in their environments that gain their social usefulness via their affective tone. The resulting personal system of created meanings becomes projected onto the world via the personal arrangement of things that are important for each person (Valsiner, 2000; Valsiner, 2005). Consequently, individual human beings constantly create meaningful parts in their environments through an affective-emotional lens when they encounter ideas, objects and spaces (Hochschild, 2003; Thrift, 2008; Boys, 2011). Spaces become defined by who are using them, how and when, bringing relationships and human constructs to the fore; space becomes one of our means of thinking about the world and embodying thought into action (Urry, 2005; Thrift, 2008; Boys, 2011).

In educational theory, teaching and learning are increasingly being framed in the context of affective-emotional encounters (Hargreaves, 2001; Zembylas and Vrasidas, 2004; James, 2006; James, 2009; Boys, 2011). Previous notions of schools environments have de-contextualised the work spaces from the teacher centred processes that occur within and result in separating the teacher from their wider social and affective practices (Shilling, 1991; Lankshear et al, 1996). Relationalism opens the study of school space to the dynamic and complex processes of change allowing a teacher's view of space to become performative and events based and highlights how humans are not just engaged in meaningful action but are also engaged in embodied action as spaces become an active presence in social practice (Tuan, 1977; Crang and Thrift, 2000). Therefore, teachers' approach to space can be seen as ordered via feelings and emotions and open new avenues of insight into schools as affective-emotional institutions. Consequently, the study of teachers in schools becomes the study of

their affective relations within the environment. It becomes the study of how teachers shape, alter and transform their environment by creating humanized forms and by how the school environment transforms teachers who work within it.

The aim of the Research Enquiry is:

> *To analyse schools from the perspective of teachers' affective-emotional zones*

The research questions are:

> *How do participants in a school make sense of their work environment through the lens of affective-emotional zones?*
>
> *How are affective-emotional zones characterized in terms of display rules and feeling rules?*
>
> *What challenges do teachers face when they are in particular affective-emotional zones and why?*

The enquiry is ordered: The literature review, the methodology chapter, data presentation, the discussion chapter and a conclusion chapter.

Chapter 2 - Literature Review

An aim of the literature review will be to orientate affect towards the individual construction of meaning and outline how affective-emotional notions configure a predominantly psychological paradigm within a school setting. I outline approaches to institutions and analyse structures that provide affective meaning and definition for the people who work within them. I elucidate workplaces through an affective-emotional lens and introduce an ecological approach to space and suggest affective-emotional zones can be used to provide insight into schools as work places for teachers.

Chapter 3 - Methodology

I aim to articulate appropriate ways to research teachers' affective-emotional experiences in schools. I outline the design of the enquiry, how I collected data and how I analysed it. I

conclude with a brief overview of how I worked with the literature to build a philosophical framework for the study.

Chapter 4 – Data Presentation

I place emphasis on individual construction of meaning and structure the data according to each individual teacher's experience under the research questions. There is a deliberate attempt to capture the *emotional vocabulary* (Hochschild, 2003) of teacher stories and the broad range of their experience.

Chapter 5 – Discussion

I use the discussion chapter to make sense of emergent themes within the data and offer cross case analysis and summary.

Chapter 6 - Conclusion

I summarise my findings and make recommendations based on the main themes of the data. I also pose a number of questions for future research and then outline reflexive thoughts on the enquiry.

Chapter 2 - Literature Review

In the following chapter I introduce *feelings*, *emotions* and the *emotional management perspective.* I then offer a section where I briefly consider ontological and epistemological implications for the problem space. I then outline how feelings and emotions have been represented in schools and how they, coupled with Hochschild's notions, can be used to inform understandings of school spaces. I used this final section to contextualize the enquiry before the research questions. Where appropriate, I write short concluding sections. These do not appear at symmetrical intervals through the literature review but where I consider the reader may need greater orientation towards the key assumptions.

2.1 Feelings and emotions

2.2 The emotional management perspective

2.3 Ontological considerations and epistemological assumptions

2.1. Feelings and emotions

Definitions

Education literature can often lack a clear definition of feelings and emotions and this bedevils analysis. Emotions, moods and feelings are used interchangeably (e.g. Boler, 1997; Zorn and Boler, 2007), it is therefore important for any researcher to offer clarity before proceeding. Kagan (2007) distinguishes between the brief (phasic) reaction to an event for emotions and the longer lasting (tonic) states that can be characterized as moods. James (2009) argues writers generally agree feelings and moods can be distinguished on the basis that feelings are temporary and intense, whereas moods are more persistent and lower in intensity. Feelings also have an identifiable rationale and definable content which is typically not the case with moods. Forgas (1992) and Fineman (1993) take the view that feelings are what we experience while emotions are the behavioural expression of those feelings. Emotion can also be viewed as simply the interpretation of a change in arousal (Mandler, 1975). However, Zajonc (1980) is willing to regard a singular preference for one event over another as evidence for an emotion even if the person did not experience any change in feeling as the choice was made. It should be noted in the literature discussed below, *emotions* was the predominant term used even though in many instances researchers are discussing accepted definitions of emotions *and* feelings.

Any approach to feelings and emotions should consider physiology, cognition, and behavioural expression. Kagan (2007) outlines how humans have semantic concepts for imagined events and creatures that do not exist (such as an elf) and perceptual representations for experiences that do not have a consensual semantic label (for example, the smell of a wet dog). Cognition in this way produces bodily reactions which can be considered real by the individual feeling them and causes the researcher to question what is relevant. Perceptual construction can be seen when distinguishing between fear and anxiety; fear is usually seen as a response to a known, external source whereas anxiety is seen as a response to an unknown or imprecise internal source (Kaplan and Sadock, 1998).

Emotions can have an incompleteness, they can be seen as vague and unformed (Oatley and Jenkins, 2003). They can also be viewed as having a conscious, informational side that understands in the cognitive sense (Crawford, 2009). It is worth noting cognition and emotions have a varied history and can present problems for a researcher. During the cognitive revolution in psychology, affect was seen as noise, or error variance, in the cognitive system (Forgas, 1992). Cognition was seen as affect-*less* in its most perfect form, but now the trend is to see them both as part of a universal whole (Bower, 1981; Forgas 1992; Scherer, 2004; Kagan, 2007;). An example being attitudes, few consider attitudes without a cognitive and affective component as influencing both the formation and behavioural outcome (Miller and Tesser, 1992). Feelings and emotions are still seen as *interfering* in cognition in some quarters and there is some evidence to support the idea that feelings and emotions can impair what has been seen as the smoother process of cognition, through either suppressing feelings and emotions and/or exaggerating them (Baumeister, Bratislavsky, Muraven and Tice 1998). Alternatively, feelings and emotions can also be seen as contributing to cognition though prioritizing what is needed to be attended to while de-valuing what is considered less important (DeSousa, 1987). In this sense, feelings and emotions become dynamic and available for *work* to enhance cognition.

Other approaches state emotions can be viewed as an abstract, value free constructs referring to four different imperfectly related phenomena:

i. A change in brain activity to select incentives.
ii. A consciously detected change in feeling that has sensory qualities.
iii. A cognitive process that interpret and/or label the feeling with words.
iv. A preparedness for, or display of, a behavioural response

(Kagan, 2007; Scherer, 2004).

Kagan (2007) labels (i.) as feeling and (iii.) as emotion but accepts the levels of potency for each phenomena will be open to debate.

Recent work has highlighted how emotions are theorized as a private, natural and individualized, essentially located within the individual (Hargreaves, 2001; Harding and Pribram, 2004) rather than products of social interaction. Theorizing emotions as private and

individual is an articulation of feeling in the Kagan definition. Viewing emotions through a public-behavioural lens posits emotions as enactors in the environment while being products of collaboration (Bartky, 1990; Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996; Fortier, 2005).

Hochschild (1983) outlines two viewpoints for feelings and emotions; the organismic and interactional perspectives. The organismic model has emerged from the work of Darwin, William James and Freud. Emotions are primarily a biological process and are not necessarily known by the individuals experiencing them. Emotion can be *preconscious*; present but not acknowledged, they are part of our instinctive processes triggered by social events. Biological universals are emphasized at the expense of psycho-social phenomena and therefore, human corporeality becomes the predominant paradigm for viewing the human condition.

The interactional perspective emerges from the work of John Dewey, Hands Gerth, C. Wright Mills and Erving Goffman. Emotion has a biological element, but the emphasis is on *meaning* that is attached to physiological changes. Attending to meaning helps shape the emerging emotions and the interactional model points to individual differentiation and experience creation that is modified by coding, management and expression in the social milieu.

Hochschild's (2003) approach defines emotion as: "…bodily cooperation with an idea, thought, or attitude" (: 75), labels can usually be attached to the cooperation as long the individual is aware of the interplay. For Hochschild, emotion is also defined *by context* as she shackles emotion to the "situation to which it is attached" (1983: 212). Emotion is a biologically given sense and a "means by which we know about our relation with the world" (1983: 229). Feeling, for Hochschild (2003) is simply a "milder emotion" (: 75) although she uses them interchangeably. However, to name a feeling is to name our way of seeing something, an apprehended reality in relation to the self (Hochschild, 1983).

Concluding thoughts

For the purposes of this enquiry I accept the cognitive view of emotions from Kagan (2007), Scherer (2004) where, to be considered emotions, experiences should be interpreted and labelled. I also accept the experience and behavioural position of Forgas (1992) and Fineman (1993)

where emotion is a behavioural construct projected onto the external environment and feelings are what we experience. I accept there are motivational forces within the individual to use emotions to enact change in the environment (Bartky, 1990; Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996; Fortier, 2005; James, 2009). I also accept the contextual position of Hochschild however I reject her rather weak position on the demarcation of feelings and emotions. Therefore, feelings become internal experience and emotions behavioural projection. The term *affect* will be used to indicate more general aspects of feelings and emotions (Crawford, 2009) and the term affective-emotional will be used to label the impact of both feelings and emotions on behaviour. There is also an issue of plurality in the literature – some refer to emotion, others refer to emotions, I favour the plural approach because it is redolent of multiple behaviours; an essential aspect of social science (Arendt, 1958; Lawrence, 2003; Jovchelovitch, 2007). The ascent of plurals does not deny that there may be one way of negotiating a particular reality, but it does focus the researcher on the multiple personal nuances of the researched (Bauman, 1991; Hayes 1998; Dahlberg, Moss and Pence, 1999). Therefore I usually refer to *emotions*. The reader should note a great deal of the research offered below does not and moreover, many researchers do not distinguish between feelings and emotions. In sum: When behavioural expression is described I use the term *emotions.* When internal experience is described I use the term *feelings*. When there is no clear position or I think both are being invoked I use the terms *affect*, *feelings and emotions* or *affective-emotional*.

2.2. The emotional management perspective

Feelings and emotions in the workplace

Affect is a key characteristic of the post-industrial workplace. Feelings and emotions influence workplaces through norms and expectations, social structures and moral discourses (Fineman, 2008). Fineman (1993) suggests organisations are best understood as emotional *arenas* where emotions are performed for particular audiences and developed the notion into *emotionologies*, a notion that illustrates the social aspect of feelings and emotions. Feelings and emotions are constitutive of organizational life because they are constitutive of all human experience (Damasio, 2000; Armstrong, 2007). Workplaces are particularly hubs of anxiety, confusion and affective-emotional turmoil (Bion, 1961; Klein and de Riviere, 1974 Hirschhorn, 1988; Mawson, 1994; Stokes, 1994; Jacques, 1995) and Armstrong (2007) wonders if the confusion is not in itself an integral part of organizational function.

Affective-emotional defence mechanisms are enacted which influence the nature of the subsequent interactions (Higgins, 1989, cited in Turner, 1999). For example, the *use of fantasy* becomes a response to work reality and can allow people to step out of their roles and create a surreal world in which to meet challenges and defend against anxiety. (Klein and de Riviere, 1974; Hirschhorn, 1988). According to Hirschhorn, these fantasises are filled with violence as people punish themselves and imagine others as their persecutors, filling their thoughts with infantile experiences and caricatured fairy tale characters, representing good and evil (Hirschhorn, 1988). However, Hirschhorn does not explain if these fictions exist outside the individual and live on as storied realities between members of the group to manage anxiety and influence feelings and emotions. Klein (1959) discussed narratives and richly drawn characters serving as stages for the emotional inner life of her subjects and this can manifest itself most prominently when we experience other people not as they are, but as we *need them to be*, so they can continue their roles in our internally constructed drama (cited in Halton, 1994). Hirschhorn's and Klein's focus on fantasy life can seem whimsical but it is worth noting they do ground their work in reality based settings and acknowledge the limits of metaphor.

More obvious mechanisms for regulating affect are *routines.* Menzies (1975) describes how procedures and routines in nursing, such as wearing a uniform and rotating nurses among patients, were instituted primarily to control work related anxiety. The *organizational ritual* is the most durable and externalized defence against work related anxiety. The ritual is far more impersonal, particularly when compared to other defences such as covert coalitions and fantasies. For Hirschhorn (1988) the impersonal is what makes it so durable because it is entirely externalized onto a set of mandated actions, which do not depend on the affective skills of particular people to maintain it. Rituals help *all* groups depersonalize their relationship to their work.

Emotional labour

Goffman during the 1950s developed his theory of *social situationism*, an intermediate level of conceptual elaboration between social structure and personality (Goffman, 1959). The

focus was centred on one-by-one encounters, in which characters had to manage *outward appearance* in order to interact in the social world. Each episode takes the form of a mini-government with rules and taxes to pay in the form of expected behaviour to maintain the social order. However, a key shortcoming of Goffman's work is that his characters actively manage outer appearances but not inner feelings. Hochschild developed Goffman's appearance management concept and applied it to the inner world of affective regulation replete with the conscious awareness of, and manipulation of, feelings and emotions.

Hochschild's view is built on the Freudian notion of rich inner worlds in conflict with each other. However, Freud's concept of affect was always secondary to *drive*, he argued the individual seeks to protect the ego in social situations by assessing the appropriateness of a feeling by making a comparison between feelings and situation in the abstract and acting in a way best designed to protect the ego; a dynamic inner world managing outward appearances (e.g. Freud, 1933). However, Hochschild (2003) claims this does not represent affective work, as the individual in the Freudian model is merely *controlling enthusiasm*, or the urge to show their true feelings. It should be noted, the *attempt* at suppression produces anxiety, which may manifest itself in other activities but not in the encounter in which it is generated. For Hochschild, the notion of attempting or *trying* is the essence of *emotional labour* and in this sense she may be borrowing from Freud as well as outlining the notion of *volition* without clearly stating it. However, unlike Freud, she does not explain what happens to energy once it is generated.

In the context of emotion being a trying act, Hochschild (1983) coined the term *emotional labour*, which refers to "the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display"(: 7). Emotional labour can be considered a form of impression management to the extent the labourer deliberately attempts to direct his or her behaviour towards others with the aim of fostering certain social perceptions of himself or herself and construct a certain interpersonal climate (Cheney, 1983; Gardner and Martinko 1988; Thoits, 1991). It is achieved through surface acting, deep acting, or the expression of genuine emotion and usually refers to the display of expected emotions by service agents during service encounters (Ashforth and Humphrey 1993).

Workplace skill sets to regulate feelings and emotions have been a valid of area of research for some decades (e.g. Blackburn, 1965; Snyder, 1974) with high levels of deception and cognitive manipulation being seen as the norm (Ekman & Friesen, 1975; Ashforth, 1989). However, if feelings and emotions are enhanced, faked or suppressed to meet the institutional needs, then, like an actor, an employee may use a personal event to help regulate emotional presentation at work (Grove and Fisk, 1989; Lazarus, 1991; Parkinson, 1991) and Gordon (1989) found individuals who interpreted their affective experiences through an institutional focus felt more genuine when their feelings were consistent with what they were projecting.

Jobs which require emotional labour have three characteristics in common:

1. They require face to face or voice to voice contact with the public.
2. They require the worker to produce an affective-emotional state in another person.
3. They allow the employer, through training and supervision to set rules and exercise control over the affective-emotional activities of employees.
   (based on Hochschild, 1983: 145).

Grandey (2000) proposes *emotional labour* researchers need to integrate personality variables into the *emotional labour* framework but there are other factors to consider such as gender, class and workplace autonomy; all worthy of research (Schneider and Bowen, 1985; Rafaeli and Sutton, 1989; Morris and Feldman, 1996; Wharton and Erickson,1993; Kruml and Geddes,1998; Timmers, Fischer and Manstead,1998; Gross and John, 1998; Gross, 1998b).

The notion of *value* in the context of feelings and emotions is worth highlighting (Blau, 1964; Hochschild, 1983; Brotheridge and Lee, 1998; Grandey, 2000). Value can increase or decrease, according to the anxiety levels produced by interactions, the *duration* of interactions and the variety of expressions (Morris and Feldman, 1996). Hochschild's key assumption is the organization provides *expectations* as well as *controls* the emotional expression of the employee both leading to anxiety. Consequently, there are Marxist undertones, for example: *Alienation* occurs as a result of conforming to affective expectations that are not genuine in

the service of an employer; *exploitation* occurs as the employee does not own or control the results of their emotional displays and feelings and emotions are *commoditized* as they enter a market sector (Hochschild, 1979 cited in Grandey, 2000). In the US, prescribed emotional demands from employers have led to lawsuits with Grandey (2000) reporting a recent court case where a major retail outlet chain is being sued by their customer service employees as a result of the policy of asking workers to smile at customers as this has allegedly caused sexual harassment with customers unsure of their role in the exchange; assuming the body language of the worker were genuine expressions of feeling.

Display, Framing and Feeling rules

Generally, emotions are managed according to the *display rules, framing rules* and the *feeling rules* for the organization or assigned role (Hochschild, 1983; 2003). Display rules refer to expectations for behaviour and emotional display. By regulating the arousal and cognitions that define emotions, individuals can control their emotional expressions to fit the display rules of the situation. Framing rules refer to the rules according to which we ascribe definitions or meaning to situations such as a workplace event. Similarly, employees regulate their arousal and cognitions in order to display the appropriate emotions at work via feeling rules. Framing rules and feeling rules stand back to back and mutually imply each other (Hochschild, 2003).

Display, framing and feeling rules offer guidelines for action as well as an interpretative framework through which to view affect in the workplace. Overall, we 'moderns', Hochschild (1983) argues, live in a society where we are constantly asking, "What in this situation should I be feeling?" The search for rules to govern feelings and emotions is a modern occupation and did not consume as much energy for our forebears who were used for physical labour. It is this cultural and time specific aspect of Hochschild's work that renders it appealing, she moves away from the deeper psychological motives of Freud and grounds her writing in work places. For example, the classic settings in much of the literature compare a customer service type employment such as an airline attendant who would need to display smiles and convey good humour, and those who work in law enforcement and may use an angry demeanour to achieve results specific to their institutional aims (e.g. Hochschild, 1983, Van Maanen and Kunda, 1989).

Feeling rules are internal and are what guide emotional displays by establishing the sense of entitlement or obligation that govern exchanges: "Rules as to the type, intensity, duration, timing, and placing of feelings are society's guidelines, the promptings of an unseen director" (Hochschild, 1983: 85). Feeling rules can be best illuminated by focusing on the 'pinch' between, "what do I feel?" and, "what should I feel?" (:56 and 57). Feeling rules are reinforced by subtle and sometimes not so subtle hints from other members of a group or situation, they can also be explored and subverted by the use of irony. Feeling rules reinforce appropriate feelings and behaviours in the form of social roles. Hochschild (1983) uses the example of a bride at a wedding: "A role establishes a baseline for what feelings seem appropriate to a certain series of events. When roles change, so do rules for how to feel and interpret events" (: 74). She also introduces the idea of *role expert;* an individual or individuals who are experts on what to feel for a given situation. Experts have a higher status, and those with higher status can expect greater rewards from a given situation, including emotional rewards.

At this stage I would like to introduce the notion of *heretical rules*; if feeling rules are the pinch between "what should I feel?" and "what do I feel?" and display rules are the expected emotional expressions placed on an individual by an organization, then a heretical rule is "what should I *not* feel?" in a given situation (in terms of feelings), "what would be an emotional sin?" (in terms of behaviour). Heretical rules can be differentiated from feeling and display rules as Hochschild's concepts exist in the realm of a positive ("what should I be feeling?", "What is an appropriate emotional display?"). Whereas, heretical rules are the inevitable diametric opposite, "what should I *not* be feeling?", "what should I *not* be doing?" the *anti-rule* in the Turquet (1974) sense. Heretical emotions would be an enactment of heretical feelings. My position is: an exploration of heresy in the context of feelings and emotions would allow for greater insight into Hochschild's original constructs.

2.3. Ontological considerations and epistemological assumptions

The self as an enduring construct in the context of feelings and emotions

Affect can have an incompleteness and yet can also be viewed as having a conscious, informational side that understands in the cognitive sense (Oatley and Jenkins, 2003; Crawford,

2009). Viewing feelings and emotions as part of cognition (interpreting and/or labelling with words) that ultimately provides preparedness for, or display of, a behavioural response (Scherer, 2004; Kagan, 2007) suggests feelings and emotions are tools to shield against confusion and provide order. Kagan (2007) outlines the power of cognition to produce bodily reactions which can be considered real by the individual feeling them and causes the researcher to question what is relevant. Therefore, feelings and emotions become cognitive managers, seen as influencing attitudes both in terms of prioritizing as well as influencing the behavioural outcome (DeSousa, 1987; Miller and Tesser, 1992).

Affect influences the social scene and yet it is individualized, essentially located within the individual (Hargreaves, 2001; Harding and Pribram, 2004) while still being a product of social collaboration (Bartky, 1990; Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996; Fortier, 2005). Hochschild's approach defines emotion as: "…bodily cooperation with an idea, thought, or attitude" (Hochschild, 2003: 75) while shackling emotion to the "situation to which it is attached" (1983: 212) allowing emotion to be at once corporeal and social as well as a personal perceptual tool to give us a "means by which we know about our relation with the world" (1983: 229); a *sense* that influences how individuals posit themselves in reality. For Hochschild affect is a bridge between the social and psychological; action and cognition.

Furthermore, affect when viewed through a Kagan (2007) and Scherer (2004) lens allows feelings and emotions to be viewed as signal functions, sending messages to the individual to provide order and in this way the system involves prior expectation, comparison and suggests a consistent psychological platform. Hochschild's display, framing and feeling rules results in an individual constantly asking self-referencing questions ("what should I feel?", "what do I feel?", "what should I display?" and so on) while workplaces and employers ask employees to regulate feelings and emotions with high levels of deception and cognitive manipulation being seen as the norm (Ekman & Friesen, 1975; Ashforth, 1989). Therefore, Hochschild's notions together with Kagan (2007), Forgas (1992), Fineman (1993) and Scherer (2004) characterizations of feelings and emotions raise questions over basic categories of *being*.

Subjectification is the term given to the effects of forces, practices, assemblages and relations that strive or operate to render human beings into diverse subject forms capable of taking themselves as subjects of their own as well as the practices placed upon them (Rose, 1998).

Feelings as experience, and emotions as behavioural projection pose questions that elucidate the self as a subjective state, constantly engaged in finding an enduring self in locales and practices. They focus the researcher directly on the practices that locate human beings in what Rose (1998) terms "regimes of the person" (: 25). Hochschild's feeling and display rules direct our attention to the strategies for the conduct of affective-emotional norms and routines, or the ways in which individuals experience, understand, judge and conduct themselves (Foucault, 1986a, 1986b; Rose, 1998). Feeling and display rules can be seen as *assemblages*, routines, habits and techniques within specific domains of action (Rose, 1998) such as a school. Assemblages are necessary to render the human being intelligible and allow insight into how the individual relates to their psychological interior as consistent and salient. Display and feeling rules allow for consistent regimes in the Rose (1998) sense, through which persons can reflect and experience aspects of themselves *in role*; as parents, husbands, teachers and so on; what Hochschild (2003) refers to as "a taken for granted background stream of experience" (:77). Therefore, we can posit display and feeling rules (and I suggest heretical rules) as repertoires to agent-ize the individual as known and enduring with feelings and emotions as mechanisms that construct meaning and provide affective-emotional consistency.

The notion of an enduring self can be further illustrated with the concept of *authenticity*. For Hochschild, the work environment allows two selves to emerge; the true self and the false self. Both apply to inner experience and outer acting (although she does not distinguish between them as feelings and emotions as I have elucidated here) and they offer a sense of internal and external consistency and therefore become something to take a position on. For Hochschild, it is the work environment that induces tension between the true self and the false (or unclaimed) self. Feelings as indicators of authenticity guide the self through the work environment and order what is relevant and important. Emotions become signals of one's own or other's authenticity or skill level in social guile and individuals come to have situation-specific selves, tailored to images about who they are, what they can do, and what they can expect from others (Trilling, 1972; Turner 1999). However, *de-individuation* can occur if the value of work becomes obscure and maintaining a sense of wholeness for the work-self as well as the organization becomes problematic (Ovisignkina, 1976; Perrow, 1984).

Concluding comments

In the enquiry there will be elements of the interactional and interpersonal however, I am predominantly interested in teachers' *relations with themselves* through their association with affective-emotional techniques and assemblages that allow them to exist in work spaces as a known self. To this end I am furthering Hochschild's notions of display and feeling rules and developing my own notion of heretical rules; positing them as affective-emotional assemblages in a school locale. I understand such a position is not without criticism, placing as it does the human being at the centre of meaning creation; actively negotiating his or her way through the obstacles of an exterior world with affective-emotional techniques implies a unified self, capable of thinking and elucidating the self as outside of the obstacles and techniques on which it must report.

Subjectification, the process of considering the self as a subjective state (Rose, 1998) and the act of labelling feelings and emotions (Scherer, 2004; Kagan, 2007) asks us to consider the importance of language in producing our self-knowledge; how human beings come to relate to themselves as *selves*. Human beings possess the ability to endow meaning to experience (Dean, 1994) through vocabularies, grids of visualization, norms and expectancies and so on but the devices of meaning production can also be said to produce experience and not themselves produced by experience (Joyce, 1994). Taking an interest in language offers insight into the repertoires of personhood; often specific within certain cultures or settings (Wittgenstein, 1953) causing the researcher to take an interest in the ways people discuss their feelings and emotions (Hochschild, 1983; Shotter, 1985); the *emotional vocabulary* in the Hochschild (2003) sense.

It should be noted: I am not denying the existence of other approaches (such as a social constructionist position) within the problem space. However, my position is that Hochschild's notions as well as her view of the workplace presents the self as infused with individualized subjectivity, asking questions related to their feelings and emotions. In the context of Hochschild's view of the workplace, subjectivity becomes coherent and more importantly it becomes *enduring* and *individualized* compelling the researcher to take an interest in the individual and their construction of meaning in the context of where they work. Consequently, the self in the assemblages of feelings and emotions (experience and projection), feeling and

display rules becomes something to take a position for the social researcher.

2.4. Social and relational approaches to school space

School space

School space has been researched as a place between geographical boundaries and human interaction with it has been based around stimulus-response theories (Boys, 2011). There have been studies on the effects of space on health and safety and other functional issues such as the movement of people across timetables as well as the recent trend towards environmentally friendly design (e.g. Gordon et al, 2000; Design Council, 2005b). In schools, there is further interest on how wider accommodation can affect curriculum delivery particularly in the US, where academic achievement has increased with improved building conditions (e.g. Fisher, 2000; Younge, 2001). Kenneth-Tanner (2000) outlines 29 designs significantly related to student achievement and they include; desirable patterns, community spaces and student centric areas with attention paid to the colour scheme of the paint. Classroom layout has also attracted recent interest with various designs attached to different learning styles and teaching practices (e.g. *The Fat L layout*, Dyck, 1994).

Current school design and classroom layout can be traced back to the late 19th century and can present universally recognised images across nations and cultures. However, an emphasis on the physicality of school structure can blind pedagogical researchers to the meanings found within space. McGregor (2007) suggests space is part of the hidden curriculum with it being used to shape power relations as well as conveying socialisation messages. For example, in conventional secondary schools, it is usually the teachers who are allocated classrooms and then expected to 'own' it, while the students move around the school. Gordon and Lahelma (1996) found rooms were seen by students as teachers' spaces. As a consequence, hierarchical relationships are played out where the teacher is perceived to be the sole authority, transmitting knowledge and being in control. Therefore, teachers draw on space to assert power, often through the control of movement, noise and even light in the classroom.

As a profession, value is placed on maintaining orderly relations with success being measured through the control of space (McGregor, 2007). The use of language and how it relates to the

construction of school spaces and the maintenance of power regimes within should always remain a consideration as most important social processes are mediated by language (Dean, 1994; Wortham, 2008). Schools give labels to space; the classroom, the staffroom, the playground, the student lounge. Labels endow meaning and sets forth expectations of conduct promoting enduring repertoires that presupposes certain social relations (Wittgenstein, 1953; Wortham, 2008).

In educational theory, teaching and learning are increasingly being framed as a collective practice moving towards shared social meanings that are *situated* involving cognition and affective-emotional encounters (Boys, 2011). Previous notions of school enclosures have de-contextualised spaces from the teacher centred processes that occur within and serve to separate the teacher from their wider social and affective practices (Shilling, 1991; Lankshear et al, 1996). Viewing educational space through a relational lens has already produced work in fields such as culture and socio-economic areas (Lankshear et al 1996; Kostogriz and Peeler, 2004). Furthermore, architects designing educational space already think of spaces delineated through processes and behaviours, the metaphorical and performative expression of relationships (Tschumi, 1994). Koolhaas et al. (2001) have argued school buildings should be defined through the services they provide which are not fixed to school rooms but could be temporarily 'downloaded'. The buildings would not be understood by 'use' but by 'uselets', classrooms would become defined by a set of services downloaded and activated by a user. Therefore, educational design is becoming articulated as an event-based practice that as implications for how we see occupation which becomes a series of overlapping affective encounters with physical space conceptualized in terms of its relationship with those encounters using the fluctuating conditions to assemble itself (Kwon, 2004; Boys, 2011). Through a relational lens, school spaces become precarious geographical achievements enacted through school cultures and embedded repertoires, (Nespor, 2000; Philo and Parr, 2000); buffeted, created and ordered by affective-emotional processes and routines.

New technologies (media, social networking, email etc.) are a key mechanism through which attempts are being made to shift and 'reify' social and spatial practices in schools. For example, they allow researchers to critically engage with the concept of affordances (Boys,

2011). Affordances are the behaviours permitted by objects, places and events relevant to the perceiver; affordances render behaviour contextualized to the environment: To study affordances is to study meaning (Gibson, 1979; Michaels and Carello, 1979). Spaces and objects come to form a community of practice in terms of what can be related to them; affordances are not just what is functionally possible as an inherent property of *the thing*, but a product of the signals given from objects and spaces (Norman, 1988). Therefore, because new technologies in schools are potentially creating new learning spaces that have never existed before (and subsequent new affective-emotional repertoires) they offer avenues of investigation through which to investigate schools and their spaces (Boys, 2011).

Recently, there has been considerable interest in attempting to exploit the energy and the mass take up of social networking possibly because of the perceived importance of informal learning and the need to make education more 'fun' that students can be 'seduced' into learning through the use of inviting spaces (Heppell, 2009; Boys, 2011). Consequently, questions should be asked over whether new technologies represent new affective-emotional affordances for teachers or are seen as extensions of traditional learning and social school spaces and what challenges arise. Students and teachers may face problems interpreting social interactions within digital spaces as they lack the usual social cues that help define agreed meaning (the lack of voice intonation, gesture and body language on email for example, Mitchell, 2007b); leading to some students and teachers preferring the 'known' of classroom/studio based tutorial practices (Boys, 2008).

Space and affect

Human beings create societies via the unity of symbolic actions and generalized meaning fields in their environments that are often difficult to define (Valsiner, 2005). They gain their social usefulness via their affective tone and the resulting personal system of created meanings becomes projected to the world via the personal arrangement of things that are important for each person (Valsiner, 2000). For Valsiner (2000), the public visibility of personal meanings feeds into the interpersonally constructed collective culture which is composed of externalizations of personal cultures of individuals who are, however, still mutually linked through social ties. Structured semiotic mediators acting as cognitive tools (although grounded in affect) and provide guidance and meaning as people navigate social

settings in their environment (Valsiner, 2003) and are redolent of Kagan's (2007) and Scherer's (2004) view of affect. Consequently, human beings constantly create meaningful parts in their environments. Furthermore, for human cultural and social self-regulation the arrow is bidirectional as individuals actively negotiate their personal life-worlds under the guidance of the field of social and environmental suggestions (Valsiner, 2005).

Territorial awareness is an inherent characteristic of being human (Tuan, 1977). Humans have an intimate relationship with their physical environments involving sentiment, spatial knowledge, self-awareness and a heightened awareness of objects and enclosure (Tuan, 1977). Spaces demarcate our immediate experience and we come to know them viscerally, attaching significance until they draw attention to themselves with our presence known and felt within them. For Tuan, spaces become *places* when they embody an organized world of meaning resonating with identity achieved through functional rhythms of personal and group life. The study of space becomes the study of relations between humans and their processes and the environment. It becomes the study of how people shape, alter and transform their environment by creating humanized forms and by how the environment conditions and transforms the people within it. The relationship between people and their environment is thus an entire system of complex interrelations and the study of space becomes ecological in nature (Peet, 1998).

However, human life is also based on *movement* through space. Thrift (2008) cites de Certeau (1987) to illustrate how cities have multiple histories, inter-crossed writings and fragments of trajectories as people move through them altering spaces and rendering the city indefinitely something *other* (Solnit, 2000). Every creature moves in its characteristic way (Ingold, 2006), for example, the modern city is also defined by the car which has reconfigured civil society via distinct ways of dwelling, travelling and socializing through an automobilized time-space (Urry, 2000). Driving has become a profoundly embodied and sensuous experience with the metaphysical merger of the driver and the car that generates a distinctive ontology in the form of a person-thing; a humanized car, an automobilized person (Katz, 2000). Furthermore, driving can be seen as a highly attenuated form of communication via a series of emotional expressions and communication of moral codes (horns, flashing lights, braking late into

corners etc.) as people (and their cars) move through the road-space and reorder it through affective communication (Katz, 2000). The importance to humans of movement through spaces can also be seen in the popularity of new sports such as snowboarding, base jumping, surfing; sports of 'falling' that extend a streaming ethos to landscapes, turning them into motorfields of solids (Kwinter, 2001). Such sports exemplify the fluidity, and importance of movement, intuition and invention as the environment is constantly reconfigured and spatialized in the head (Thrift, 2008). Conradson (2005) refers to the "shifts in bodily energy and feeling" (: 111) as people move through space they are tasked with inhabiting which can often manifest itself in an outward form of *re-energisation* (emotion).

Consequently, the notion of 'site' can be articulated as an active and always incomplete incarnation of events, an actualization of times and spaces that uses the fluctuating conditions to assemble itself (Kwon, 2004; Thrift, 2008) and the solidity of the world can be questioned (Grosz, 2005).

Approaching spaces through an ecological lens

An ecological approach is characterized by an emphasis on the aesthetic and inventive character of geographical discourses (Barnes and Duncan, 1991). Theorists have been allowed to develop an interest in heterogeneous relations in the construction of spatial formations whereby attention is paid to the natural and the social, the human and the non-human while prioritizing the materiality of space and the way humans are embedded within spatialized materialities (Whatmore, 2002). Moreover, it is argued a concern for heterogeneity easily transforms into a concern for space as it brings together social and environmental entities within specific spatial formations and allows relationalism to come to the fore (Thrift, 1996).

The ecological subject is inherently a relational subject (Guattari, 2000). Relationalism opens the study of school space up to the dynamic and complex processes of change allowing space to become performative and events based. Relationalism highlights how humans are not just engaged in meaningful action but are also engaged in embodied action able to find themselves in an embodied world. Consequently, thought becomes equipped with apparatus to contextualize the self in an embodied object world and spaces become an active presence in

social practice (Crang and Thrift, 2000) becoming *place* in the Tuan (1977) sense. Knowledge about space, when viewed through an ecological lens becomes situated and subsequent conceptualizations of space should therefore not seek to 'represent' but resonate (Thrift, 1996; Thrift, 1999).

Thrift highlights the flow of practices in everyday life and the on-going creation of effects through encounters rather than consciously planned codings and symbols; everyday becomes a set of skills interacting with space (Thrift and Dewsbury, 2000). Thus, it can be shown space is no longer a container of heterogeneous processes; rather, space is now thought to be something that is stabilized (if only provisionally) out of dynamic skill based processes (Murdoch, 2006). Furthermore, the emphasis is placed on multiple perspectives with spaces having multiple sets of relations and we should move away from seeing space as a practico-inert container of action and move towards conceptualizing space as a socially produced set of plural manifolds (Massey, 1991). Consequently, the character of spaces is given by the processes that stabilize the (semi-) permanent spatial assemblages; dynamic configurations of relative 'permanences' within the overall spatio-temporal dynamics of ecological processes (Harvey, 1996). Therefore, space produces, and is a product of human practices; space is not pre-given, static or completed, and is always in the process of *becoming* (Massey, 1999). Human practices create and define space but also keep it in flux (McDowell, 1999). An ecological approach to space establishes the view that the 'performer' and the context of the performance are both entangled and the notion that any social act can be distinguished from the spatial context that it is performed should be abandoned (Murdoch, 2006).

If places are bound to each other relationally then scale can be conceptualized in non-territorial terms and shape and size become less important as identifying markers (Amin, 2002). Instead, places become *meeting places* (Massey, 1991) of nodes in relational settings leading to conflicts as sets of nodes jostle for spatial supremacy; space becomes energized and animated through human action and perception. Equally, there can be consensus as alliances are built and dominant alignments of approaches are forged and defined by people and their practices (Hirschhorn,1988; Murdoch, 2006), and not necessarily by the subjective interpretation of object (e.g. Armstrong, 2007); to navigate the workplace and provide

structure and focus (Galbraith, 1973).

2.5. Hochschild's notions and schools

The teaching self

There are many contexts and professions where the study of feelings and emotions is well advanced and there have been significant inroads into the affective-emotional life of teaching (Hargreaves, 2001; Zembylas and Vrasidas, 2004; James, 2006; James, 2009). Teachers' feelings and emotions are embedded in the conditions and interactions of their work; the act of teaching is an emotional practice (Hargreaves, 1999; Hargreaves, 2001). Within the Hargreaves' approach, teachers should be competent in the affective-emotional arena as affective-emotional misunderstandings undermine the foundations of teaching and learning.

Work and social situations often carry proper definitions of themselves and in each situation *rules and duties* (some personal, some institutional) set out the properties as to the extent, the direction and the duration of affective-emotional conduct (Hochschild, 2003). Consequently, the teacher is transformed into a sentient, feeling self whereby they are constantly engaged in asking self-referencing questions with regards feelings and emotions as an *everyday task*; feelings become signals that shape the sentient self both in the school and in the personal repertoires of the teacher. Therefore, affective-emotional regulation in schools has direct consequences for how teachers view themselves, their effectiveness with students and their relations with each other (Sizer, 1992; Blase and Anderson, 1995; Jeffrey and Woods, 1996; Popkewitz, 1998).

I am taking a general view of pedagogy in the enquiry. It can be defined as

> "…the activity of teaching, parenting, educating or generally living with children that requires constant *practical acting* in concrete situations and relations" (Van Manen, 1990: 2, italics mine).

The practical teaching act has been defined through disparate paradigms. For example, teaching as an act of communication (Fanselow, 1977), teaching as an act of faith (Migliazzo, 2002) and teaching as a political and ethical act (Freire, 1970; Kirk, 1986; Kincheloe, 2008).

Increasingly, teaching and learning are being seen in the context of affective-emotional encounters (Hargreaves, 2001; Zembylas and Vrasidas, 2004; James, 2006; James, 2009; Boys, 2011) and seen through a Hochschild paradigm, the teaching act becomes a series of *affective-emotional repertoires* (in the form of feeling and display rules) which asks teachers to take a position on how they feel and how they project emotions; subjectification becomes continuous and teachers become capable of taking themselves as subjects of their own as well as the practices placed upon them.

Feeling and display rules direct our attention to the strategies teachers use to regulate affective-emotional conduct in their place of work. Feeling and display rules can be seen as ways in which individuals experience, understand, judge and conduct themselves. Their consistency would imply an enduring self across time and circumstance. Hochschild speaks of emotive episodes in "brief strips of time" (2003: 265), emotional rules can also be dropped quickly to apply to each new situation and understanding the rules and enacting appropriate displays takes skill and can lead to marginalization (Hochschild, 2003) but the notion of a personality should imply a fairly durable trans-situational pattern. Viewing feelings and emotions in a work locale through a Hochschild lens allows feeling rules and display rules to change across time and circumstance but within enduring and known boundaries. Given these considerations, it is perhaps more accurate to talk of the *teaching self* rather than the *teaching act* to refer to teaching *acts* in both various times and places around the school. The term *teaching self* acknowledges the process of subjectification an individual experiences as part of *being* and it allows for inquiry into affective-emotional routines and conduct across time and circumstance.

Schools as stage managers

Hochschild (1983) posits the work/social environment as essential to understanding affect. Her foundations are rooted in concepts of *communication* and *encounter* outlined by Bell (1973) of which the service sector (such as trade, leisure, finance, transport) and what is termed the communal services and features education and health institutions. In private life, the person remains the locus of the acting process, however, the Hochschild (1983) approach views feelings and emotions through the paradigm of the institution as various elements are taken away from the individual and replaced by institutional mechanisms. Schools assume the

role of stage manager through Hochschild's lens, with objects, places and people arranged as props requiring actors to act and feel according to the needs of the school. There is a transformation, or *transmutation* of private affective-emotional systems into the public sphere.

There are similarities between Hochschild's work and more pronounced educational research. For example, Hargreaves (2001) cites *stage managing* as an example of teachers respond to the expectation of anxiety inducing situations by planning ahead and considering how they will play the situation. The benefit of the Hargreaves model is the definition of institutional managers; it includes students and parents who are positioned at the boundaries and help regulate affective-emotional life. Anxiety can also lead to *buffering*, emotional insulation from the demands of the job such as embedded behavioural routines to minimize the need to express genuine empathy (Epstein, 1998; Chambliss, 1996; Satyamurti, 1981 both cited in Hargreaves, 2001). I would argue stage managing and buffering are similar to retreating from the boundaries in the Hirschhorn (1988) sense which can lead to alienation and questions over authenticity seen in Hochschild's work as workers ask themselves about the genuineness of their feelings and become aware of the role the institution plays in utilizing them for institutional gain.

There are limitations in applying Hochschild's notions to schools. Primarily, she does not fully address the notion of anxiety in the workplace. Anxiety takes a dominant and difficult place in the affective terrain of schools because of its integral link with other feelings such as pleasure, which can be associated with guilt. Anxiety also occurs a result of many of school orientated processes such as learning, the public nature of the classroom and incidents therein, the transitional nature of relationships and the process of change (James and Connolly, 2000). Consequently, social defences are erected to manage anxiety and to protect against the pain associated with difficult feelings including; resistance, repression, denial and organizational rituals (Kets de Vries, 1991; Hirschhorn, 1990; cited in James and Connolly, 2000).

Space through a Hochschild lens

If spaces are defined by *who* is using them, *how* and *when*, then human human constructs are brought to the fore (Urry, 2005). Space becomes one of our means of thinking about the world and embodying affective-emotional constructs into action (Thrift, 2008; Boys, 2011) and draws to mind Hochschild's (1983; 2003) intimation that affect should be understood as a form of thinking.

Moreover, Hochschild argues the notion of *objectivity*, has traditionally been associated with being "free from personal feelings" (Hochschild, 1983: 31), yet we need to feel so as to reflect on and then correct for (both cognitively and behaviourally), feelings influencing our perception. Objectivity through Hochschild's lens becomes a *negotiation* with our feelings and emotions although she is not dismissing the notion of a durable reality, she is simply shackling affect to the interpretation and situating the knower through an affective-emotional paradigm.

Ultimately, feelings and emotions monitor, interpret and guide us through our encounters with ideas, objects and spaces (Chodorow, 1999; Thrift, 2008; Boys, 2011) and draws to mind the notion of *place identity* (Proshansky et al., 1983). Feelings and attitudes, ideas, memories, values and preferences towards physical settings help an individual understand the environment they live in and inform their overall experience. When an individual interacts with spaces, they are able to assess which properties fulfil their needs. Via experiences with a place, an individual can reflect and further define their personal values, attitudes, feelings and beliefs about the physical world. Therefore, place identity ties the notion of *place* into the larger concept of the *sentient self* in the Hochschild sense and turns us into "tourists of ourselves" (Hochschild, 2003: 6) asking self-referencing questions about our environment and reflects the affective bond between an individual and a place (Jorgensen and Stedman, 2001; Kyle et al., 2004).

Place identity and the internal processes it encourages can be contrasted with place *dependence* whereby the opportunities the setting affords for fulfilment of specific goals or activity needs is lacking an affective paradigm (Williams et al., 1995). Furthermore, place *attachment*, is defined via the affective ties an individual has to a place, and is generally seen as a consequence of a long-term connection with a certain environment (Altman and Low,

1992; Williams et al., 1995). However, in Hochschild's terms, feeling rules work with display rules to ascribe affective-emotional definition and meaning to situations and places and an affective-emotional piece of territory comes into existence by the delineation of a *zone*: "A feeling rule sets down a metaphoric floor, walls and ceiling, there being room for motion and play within boundaries" (2003: 98).

Moreover, through a Hochschild paradigm, situations cause feelings and emotions to become *objects of awareness* particularly when the individual's feelings do not fit the situation. Situations carry affective definitions which Hochschild refers to as an "official frame" (2003: 96) and the affective self becomes the instrument of inquiry through which to investigate social settings (Hochschild, 2003).

2.6. Aim and Research Questions

The need to act ecologically is a human need and by attending to the spatial zone where environment and people meet we elaborate how humans represent their immediate environments. Humans are enmeshed within a process of ecological symbiosis and heterogeneous relations although they retain distinctive qualities as participants able to reflect on their positions, markers and relational nodes. Humans are not disembodied subjects who maintain a privileged status in their environments, they are instead, entangled in environmental spaces and their knowledge of them is situated; humans seek to represent both their environment and their place within it. Thrift refers to the "affective swirl" that characterizes modern societies (Thrift, 2008: 25); space can be seen as forming an *inhabitable map* (Thrift, 2008) filled with the rhythms of the social machine and *spatial permanences* carved out of dynamic processes (Harvey, 1996; Murdoch, 2006). The principles of ecology become useful as they propose the production of such permanences consisting of alignments or partnerships between the environment and individuals (Merchant, 2003) compelling the researcher to take an interest in the individual construction of meaning in the context of their environment. I take 'production' to mean bringing forth an object in space (Gumbrecht, 2004).

Furthermore, teaching and learning are collective practices in shared social spaces; thinking and affective-emotional encounters are situated (Boys, 2011). An ecological perspective

allows for a re-territorialisation of the school from alternative and less definitive perspectives. In this sense, we are drawn to the concept of constructing space as a product of feelings and emotions. Affect becomes best understood not as a de-socialized or placeless but as *situated* (Parr, Philo and Burns, 2005) in the form of affective-emotional places.

Educational space as relational is a new paradigm and although it has already produced work in fields such as culture, socio-economics (Lankshear et al 1996; Kostogriz and Peeler, 2004) and time-zones (McGregor, 2003) the notion of affective-emotional zones has not been approached. Through less definitive perspectives, teachers' approach to space can be seen as ordered via feelings and emotions and open new avenues of insight into schools affective-emotional institutions.

Situations carry affective frames unique to the individual (Chodorow, 1999), therefore, individuals become the instrument of inquiry through which to investigate social settings as feeling rules work with display rules to ascribe affective-emotional definition and meaning to situations and places in the form of affective-emotional zones. Affective-emotional zones offer scope for attended space; breaking the school environment into affective-emotional units of detection and providing avenues for investigation; representing grids of affective-emotional norms, expectancies and repertoires that agentize the individual within work spaces. Consequently, the study of space becomes the study of relations between humans and their processes (in the form of affective-emotional zones) and the environment. It becomes the study of how humans shape, alter and transform their environment by creating humanized forms and by how the school environment conditions and transforms teachers who work within it.

The Aim and research questions can be stated as:

> Aim: To analyse schools from the perspective of teachers' affective-emotional zones

Research questions:

> How do participants in a school make sense of their work environment through the lens of affective-emotional zones?

How are affective-emotional zones characterized in terms of display rules and feeling rules?

What challenges do teachers face when they are in particular affective-emotional zones and why?

Chapter 3 - Methodology

3.1. Introduction

In the following chapter I outline the fundamental assumptions that underpin the enquiry by orientating the reader with the philosophical framework. I then outline the procedural elements of how I addressed the research questions and then explain my approaches to data collection and analysis. Finally, I explain how I made my choices for inclusion in the discussion of literature and the critiquing processes I undertook. Therefore this chapter is divided:

3.2. Philosophical Framework
3.3. Design
3.4. Data Collection and Analysis
3.5. Credibility/validity
3.6. Working with the Literature

3.2. Philosophical Framework

3.21. Direct Perception

Direct perception considers perception to be the direct detection of information via processes in an animal-environment system, not solely in an animal (Gibson, 1979). It can be contrasted with indirect perception that assumes the senses are provided with an impoverished view of the world and therefore cognitive operations intervene and embellish the source to provide richer interpretations of the environment. Constructionists assume animals are active in the embellishment sense, engaged in cognitive activities that add to the meagre information flow. Direct perception assumes animals are active, purposeful explorers of their environments, if the informational array is lacking then the animal will engage in activities that allow it to

collect more information. Direct perception research is the search for patterns that specify an environment to an animal (Shaw and Bransford, 1977) and falls within an ecological approach because three important emphases emerge: The unit of analyses must be the animal-environment system; the animal must be considered under natural conditions, knowing its *own* environment; the animal must be considered an active investigator, not simply an inhabitant of its environment.

Information is the structured energy (light, sound or other medium) that specifies objects, places and events to an animal. However, it is a bi-directional arrow, one arrow pointing to the environment and one pointing to the animal. Information becomes a dual concept whose components can be described as information-*about* (the environment) and information-*for* (the animal); it is a bridge between the knower and the known and cannot usefully be described without a specification of both as individuals actively negotiate their personal life-worlds under the guidance of the field of social and environmental suggestions (Gibson, 1960; Valsiner, 2005). Shaw and McIntyre (1974) put forward the notion that some areas of the environment can contain more information than others. Information strength means some types of information are more likely to be detected than others and is referred to as *attensity*. Information that has less attensity will go unnoticed (or noticed *less*) which draws a key difference between the ecological view and the traditional information processing approach: The information processing approach assumes inputs from the environment are rejected (and academic enquiry is focused on how and where the rejection takes place) whereas the ecological stance simply assumes the inputs are not detected.

It is worth noting an approach to information attensity is redolent of approaches to attention. Traditional approaches to attention assume a standard filter placed over a potentially overwhelming array and a weeding out of inputs; selected and discarded (e.g. Cherry, 1953). Gibson's approach is better described as the *control of detection* whereby limits are placed on what information can be detected. Therefore, the ecological position asserts intention must be considered. An intention (or set of intentions) limits both the information that is detected and the biological procedures used to detect that information (Michaels and Carello, 1979).

Furthermore, information invariants specify salient aspects of the environment for each organism and each organism has specific needs and wants from its environment; behaviour becomes contextualized to the environment in the form of *affordances* (Gibson, 1979). Affordances are the behaviours permitted by objects, places and events and it is the affordance that is detected by the animal not the object. For example, a chair is not perceived as a chair but as a place to sit; sitting being the affordance that is relevant to the animal. For perception to be valuable it has to be manifested in an appropriate action on the environment. Moreover, for actions to be appropriate and effective they must be regulated by accurate perception of the environment (Fitch and Turvey, 1978). The purposeful behaviours themselves are termed *effectivities* (Shaw and McIntyre, 1974 after von Neumann, 1966) and are, again, specific to the animal; whether an animal possesses effectivities of swimming, crawling or feeling and expressing emotions will determine the affordances it can detect: To study affordances is to study meaning (Michaels and Carello, 1979).

An ecological position places emphasis on the animal detecting enough useful knowledge (termed *ecological knowledge*) to act meaningfully on its environment (Shaw, Turvey and Mace, 1982). Thus, knowledge becomes a pragmatic entity leading to useful action; for actions to fit with affordances an organism does not need to be apprised of all the information in an environment, merely that an animal perceive enough information to do something appropriate and effective. Different perceivers perceive different invariants of information (a bottle can be used to deliver a drink to the mouth or thrown at someone's head) and veridical perception is not demonstrated when more than one organism perceives the same invariant in the same way but when an animal does something that is compatible with the affordances of the situation. Therefore, effective action (as constrained by ecological knowledge) on the part of the organism being studied should be the only criterion for judging the veridicality of perception (Shaw, Turvey and Mace, 1982).

The ecological approach can be philosophically aligned with *realism*. Realism assumes there are objects and events whose existences do not depend on being perceived. It can be contrasted with idealism that holds properties of objects owe their existence to being perceived (Michaels and Carello, 1979). An obstacle to realism arises when it is considered

different individuals experience the same objects differently and the same individuals experience objects differently on different occasions. However it should be noted, realism contextualizes behaviour to the specific animal and the properties of the environment are ascertained through reference to the animal doing the behaving. Therefore, different individuals experience the same objects differently as the affordances (what is being perceived) depend on the animal.

There are problems with identifying direct perception too closely with realism as there are elements of *pragmatism* as outlined by James in the early twentieth century (James, 1909). Pragmatism deems truths to be invaluable instruments of action in the sense they only hold value in terms of what they pay or elicit in terms of useful action. What is true is nothing more than what is useful or yields a satisfactory outcome. Although a pragmatist perspective steers truth closely to a constructionist position in the sense that it becomes subjective (what is useful to one individual is not to another), truth no longer becomes a static property within an idea but what happens when the idea is put into practice: Truth happens to the idea; it becomes true, is made true by events and our experience of them (James, 1907b).

3.22. Correspondence theory of construct

A correspondence theory of truth assumes truth is a substantive property. Whatever is true (a truth-bearer) is made true by something else (a truth-maker) and constructionism is rejected as a truth-bearer corresponds to a truth-maker (Englebretsen, 2006). A correspondence theory of truth asserts that facts are truth makers as they serve as the non-linguistic correlates of true statements. It can be contrasted with post-modernism which points to an absence of definitive knowledge; context, content, and voice are all relative to each other and positions 'reality' relationally (Drake, 2010). Such a position has traditionally asked social scientists to consider the act of interpretation with the aim of increasing one's thoughtfulness towards the world (Marcel, 1949; Gadamer, 1986; Bollnow, 1994) which may at times appear disorientating (Giddens, 1990). For post-modernists, seeking a definitive end to a problem is not seen as credible (Weber, 1963; Van Manen, 1990; Jovchelovitch, 2007) and measuring and claims to definitiveness are seen as simplistic. There is an avoidance of facts and an intolerance of truth (Englebretsen, 2006).

A correspondence theory of truth asserts the truth of a belief depends on the objects (as opposed to the words) being combined with or separated from their attributes. Our statements of truth fail when correspondence to truth fails; objects are not as we say they are. However, objects cannot be so easily drawn into existence through thought. The truth in thoughts exists independently of us; truth does not come into existence when we think it to be; the truth of a thought according to a realist position is timeless (and independent of thought); truth does not come into existence with its discovery (Frege, 1967).

Propositions

Belief appears in the form of *propositions*: Propositions are abstract objects; they are what is believed, conjectured, supposed, hoped guessed at and finally expressed. When propositions are stated we claim truth for them. A claim is an expression of commitment to something. It can be seen as sponsoring of the proposition via language reminding us human meaning-making is a dialogical process (Josephs, Valsiner and Surgan, 1999). Propositions are true when they have constituent properties. Constituent properties are signified by sentences used to express the propositions (Englebretsen, 2006). Propositions are something to take a position on; to believe or not to believe – beliefs have propositions as their objects (Moore, 1953).

Domains

Domains refer to the immediate environment and are usually sub-totalities of the world (Englebretsen, 2006) while they are themselves totalities of objects (Frege, 1892a). Domains are in the world are characterized by properties (and not propositions). Properties are permanent and can be positive or negative: Soup can be salty (salt being present in the soup) and is therefore the soup is characterized by a positive constituent (the constituent being salt). Soup can also be meatless and is therefore characterized by a constituent that is absent from it (meat). Properties and their lack thereof, are independent of our ability to speak them. However, the lack of a property must always be distinguished from its negation: There is an important difference between saying that a man in unsighted and saying that a stone is unsighted. Lacking sight (as in the stone) affirms a negative; not having sight (as in the man)

denies a positive and they are distinct from one another.

A key element of correspondence theory is the notion that statements we make (by combining words in appropriate ways) are true just in case such combinations correspond to the ways objects and their attributes are actually combined/separated. Truth becomes a matter of correspondence between ideas and reality. Statements signify constituent properties. Constituent properties belong to the domain to which the statement is made (Peirce, 1931).

Considerations

A correspondence theory of truth as presented above has some key shortcomings. For example, it can appear contrived and superficial (Newman, 2002); statements can be seen as fitting facts too easily (Strawson, 1949); and overall there can be seen to be a certain amount of ambiguity associated with the notion of correspondence (Newman, 2002). Perhaps, such ambiguity can be due in part to the arrangement of sentences (and the components contained therein) used to describe facts and the extent to which they correspond with the arrangement of the components of the fact. Such a criticism will always exist as long as one is attempting to correspond sentences with facts and is by no means an easy issue (Newman, 2002). Furthermore, correspondence via correlation (rather than via congruence) can mean the structure of the sentence and the structure of the corresponding facts to be different types of thing (Mulligan et al., 1984) which leads to further ambiguity. It is perhaps worth noting, an argument to the effect that economy and simplicity would be good guides to the truth would be useful if such an argument could be invented (Newman, 2002).

Furthermore, a compositional view of facts implies that not every true sentence corresponds to a fact and it does not require that each true sentence should be made true by a single fact (Newman, 2002). Although such a position can be contested (e.g. Davidson, 1996) as facts can be seen as only existing in the world as things that correspond to a sentence. Such a position is a linguistic view of facts; a compositional view of facts implies that not every true sentence corresponds to a *known* fact.

My stated view of propositions could be criticized as too minimalist: If affective-emotional

zones (as propositions) are brought into being by being expressed through the use of terms to describe constituent properties (in the form of feeling, display and heretical rules) in the form of sentences, then there is a discussion to be had over the relation between asserting a statement and uttering sentences and the extent to which a statement is contained within those sentences and the components therein (Newman, 2002). There are also discussions to be had over the nature of sentences and statements. For example, it is noted that it is possible to make a single statement by uttering many different sentences (Cartwright, 1987) which would have particular resonance in an international setting where different dialects and languages are commonplace and in a research setting that is interested in how participants describe their feelings and emotions.

There are more nuanced views of propositions than the ones stated above. For example, Bradley and Swartz (1979) see them as non-tangible, timeless entities and abstract from the sentences that express them. Furthermore, a Russellian stance down plays the two-place relation with the proposition and the person who thinks the proposition (in this case myself and affective-emotional zones) and emphasises the relation between the person and the particulars that the proposition is about and the relation with the relation itself (Newman, 2002). Such a position would be useful within a constructivist outlook as language could be used to explore the components of the proposition, conducive to the individual psychological grain I have decided to pursue.

3.23. Implications for the enquiry

An affordance is what an environment means to a perceiver. Effectivities are the actions taken and refers to what the teachers actually do with the information provided by affordances. It is the task of the researcher to interact with the participants to present the environment and demarcate units to be detected and discussed and then have participants reflect on how and why they perceive them the way they do. The descriptions of an environment that are relevant to the activities of knowing must be in terms of the animal doing the knowing. Consequently, any description of the environment that is appropriate to the investigation of perceiving and acting must come from an analysis of an animal-environment system at an individual psychological grain (Michaels and Carello, 1979).

I remind the reader of my stated view of feelings and emotions: I accepted the cognitive view of emotions from Kagan (2007), Scherer (2004) where, to be considered emotions, experiences should be *interpreted* and labelled. I also accept the experience and behavioural position of Forgas (1992) and Fineman (1993) where emotion is a behavioural construct projected onto the external environment and feelings are what we experience. The interpretation may lie with the researcher or the researched; researching feelings and emotions should allow a more interactional, context-focused enquiry leading to greater plausibility and texture (Fineman, 2004). I will discuss this in more depth in relation to active interviewing but for current purposes I suggest the act of *naming* feelings and emotions as well as spaces associated with them places importance on how individuals *describe* their feelings and emotions but it does not bring them into being as they already exist: Feelings cannot be unfelt; emotions cannot be unexpressed.

I am searching for constituent affective-emotional characteristics attributed to school spaces (positive and negative) expressed through statements that I take to correspond with teachers' experiences. Affective-emotional zones are propositions by virtue of their positive constituent properties (what they have) and by the negative constituent characteristics (what they do not have). In an idealized form, heretical feelings are a positive constituent characteristic of an affective-emotional zone (as they exist inside a particular zone) but the corresponding heretical emotions (if they were absent) would be a negative constituent characteristic. However, it is possible to imagine heretical emotions being present and in these instances they would be considered positive constituent characteristics.

I suggest affective-emotional zones are propositions as expressed by myself as a researcher. There can be no unexpressed propositions, no unthought thoughts (from a cognitive position), similarly, there can be no unfelt feelings and (given the behavioural definition of emotions) no unexpressed emotions (from an affective-emotional position). The key characteristic of propositions is that they are what is believed, conjectured, supposed, hoped guessed at and finally expressed (Englebretsen, 2006). Propositions are true when they have constituent properties. The constituent properties of affective-emotional zones are display, feeling and heretical rules as signified by sentences used to describe them. The zones (as propositions) are

therefore something to take a position on; to believe or not to believe as beliefs have propositions as their objects (Moore, 1953).

A statement regarding my philosophical position:

1. The perceiving animal and the acting animal are one and the same; the action system (effectivity structure) and the environment (affordance structure) are in a relationship of dynamic symmetry between the animal and environment (Michaels and Carello, 1979).
   1.1. Animal-environmental dualism is rejected. Perception is posited as an individual *knowing* its environmental niche as a system (Turvey and Shaw, 1979). Thus, if the individual is the knower and the environmental niche is the known, one cannot be described without the other; a complete description of a niche describes the individual that occupies it; a complete description of an individual describes its niche.
   1.2. Teachers (the knowers) are constituent properties of school spaces (the niche). School spaces have teachers as constituent properties.

2. Feelings and emotions are constituent properties and are expressed in statements.
   2.1. Feelings and emotions are not propositions: Feelings cannot be unfelt; emotions cannot be unexpressed.
   2.2. Feelings and emotions do not come into being by being expressed through statements.
   2.3. Social situations cause feelings and emotions to become objects of awareness.
   2.4. Statements about feelings and emotions are facts as feelings and emotions are proper objects of knowledge.

3. Domains are our immediate environment and have constituent properties.
   3.1. School spaces are domains and are sub-totalities of the school.
   3.2. Schools are totalities of domains.
   3.3. School spaces are themselves totalities of objects and statements uttered about them indicate the domain as that which is referred to.
   3.4. School spaces have teachers as constituent properties.

3.5. Feelings and emotions are constituent properties of teachers in school spaces.

4. Affective-emotional zones are propositions. Propositions are abstract objects created by the use of terms.
   4.1. Affective-emotional zones are brought into being by being expressed through the use of constituent properties.
   4.2. The constituent properties of affective-emotional zones are feelings and emotions in the form of feeling, display and heretical rules.
   4.3. Affective-emotional zones as propositions can have many constituent properties.
   4.4. Affective-emotional zones as propositions can be true or false.

3.3. Design

This section describes the research processes I engaged in and with whom to collect data. I begin with a summary to orientate the reader and end with a discussion of insider research.

Summary of my research

I approached colleagues within my own working environment with whom I had a working knowledge of. I based my judgment on previous staffroom conversations, experience with disciplinary procedures, years of experience, colleagues I had worked closely with on pastoral issues and colleagues I had seen following through with pastoral issues around the school. I prepared summaries of Hochschild's notions and a generalized map of a school with known spaces labelled (classrooms, corridors, cafeteria, toilets, and principal's office) with the expectation of uncovering affective-emotional experiences, routines and habits. I encouraged teachers to tell me *stories* related for each space as a way to provide context for them. I used an active interview technique as outlined by Gubrium and Holstein, (1995) but I was also influenced by Strauss and Corbin (1998) in my conscious choosing of certain types of questions at certain points in the interview. Throughout, I wanted to allow the participants to tell stories related to their affective-emotional involvement with the school using their indigenous language and a common mode of thinking (Moscovici, 1988). I often referred to the map of the school and set up point A's and point B's (for example: Imagine walking from your classroom to the office area) and asked the participants to self-report on their feelings

and emotions as they travelled. I used Hochschild's notions to drive the questioning such as: What is happening in terms of display? How are you feeling? What should you be feeling? Have you ever felt differently? What should you not be feeling? I was searching for affective-emotional patterns as the participants moved through the day and through the spaces of the school. I then sought consistencies within the data to characterize spaces with similar display, feeling and heretical rules. The principle method of analysis I used was Open Coding based on Grounded Theory outlined by Strauss and Corbin (1998).

The Study School

The school is a Northern European International School with approximately 1200 students attending. The school primarily serves western families and is English speaking. To this end the school predominantly hires western teachers who have more than two years of experience as an international teacher and usually requires European or North American teacher qualifications. I only interviewed teachers from the High School section of the school where the students are aged between 14 and 18. The High School section had a clearly demarcated geographical area and none of the participants worked in other sections.

Participant Selection

I decided to approach colleagues whom I had a working knowledge of. The sampling method can be deemed *purposeful* or *judgemental* in the sense that I chose colleagues who I deemed appropriate for the study. I wanted to make sure any sample was sophisticated enough to understand the issues and be able to talk knowledgeably and sensibly about school events. They needed to be experienced in dealing with students and teachers and be 'career orientated' in the sense they had an active interest in the school and be able to talk knowledgeably and enthusiastically. I did not want participants who would be confused about the notions behind the study. I recognize such an approach has shortcomings and these are addressed in the conclusion chapter.

I had seen Teacher 1 attend disciplinary issues many times with Grade 9 students, she was popular with students despite being a lead force in discipline she was good at setting deadlines for students and holding them accountable. She was regularly asked to be graduation speaker

by the student council; Teachers 2, 3 4 and 6 ran after school clubs; Teachers 3, 4 and 5 were experience school trip leaders dealing with parents, students and other teachers as well as the admin duties school trips entail; Teachers 3, 4 and 5 had both spoken in staff meetings about addressing student pastoral needs through the teaching staff as opposed to the school's current model of using the counsellor as the main conduit for pastoral issues; Teacher 2 was chosen specifically because she spent a lot of time in her classroom at lunchtime helping weaker academic students and I considered her at ease around teenagers as she played games such as cards with students rather than socialize in the staffroom.

Participants

There were six participants, all aged between the ages of thirty and forty, white and had been teaching internationally for over five years. All were in some position of administrative authority.

Teacher 1: Female, British and had taught in three international schools. She had British training in the form of the PGCE which she was particularly proud of as well a background in drama productions at school. She was also head of department. I considered this teacher to be experienced and ambitious for administrative promotion. She sat on a number of committees and involved herself in many aspects of school life, both in academic and extra-curricular. Teacher 1 was a popular and vocal member of the school teaching community and mentored some of the younger and less experienced teachers. She often acted as a go between for some members of staff with administration. I socialized with Teacher 1 at staff parties and in the staffroom. We often shared duties together. She had adopted a rather motherly approach to me which she brought to the interviews. Teacher 1 was slightly older than me and more experienced and she enjoyed the act of 'explaining' when she was around me. I had found her supporting many of my own positive views of students at meetings and I knew she was skilled in dealing with parents and members of staff who were less supportive of the school.

Teacher 2: Female, Canadian and had taught in two international schools. She was also head of department but considered herself less experienced than some of the other participants. She also ran a club for after-school activities but does not see herself as ambitious for promotion

preferring to impact student development in less obvious ways. I socialized with Teacher 2 and her then boyfriend. She had used me when she first came to the school for social and academic support, a role I was happy to fulfil. Teacher 2 could be quite shy around me in larger groups but was far more forthright in private. We had developed a relationship were we could be extremely honest with each other and enjoyed each other's company which benefitted data gathering.

Teacher 3: Female, British and head of department. She had British training and had been a union rep at her former school in the UK. She considers herself to be experienced and ambitious but this was her first international school. She had been involved in a number of pastoral incidents in the UK and partnered with social services to solve a number of difficult problems with students. Teacher 3 and I had a rather distant relationship. We did not always agree on various school policies we engaged with but it was jovial disagreement which benefited the data gathering. I knew she had a very positive relationship with all of her students and could be vocal about those relationships in staff meetings. Interviews with Teacher 3 were combative and high energy and reflected our social relationship.

Teacher 4: Male, British and with some administrative authority that required him to write large amounts of emails. He was relatively inexperienced in terms of years but had spent some time in the state system in the UK in what he described as "tough schools". He considered discipline issues to be mild on the international scene and was ambitious for future administrative promotion. The school was his first international posting but he saw himself as an international careerist and was clear about his desire not to return to a UK teaching post.

Teacher 5: Male, British and very similar to Teacher 4 in terms of background and outlook with stints in 'tough schools" in the UK. He dealt with discipline issues with many students and was a "go-to-guy" for many less accomplished members of staff who had discipline issues in their classrooms. Teacher 5 could be very vocal in the staffroom about issues and this is why I initially approached him for the study. He proved to be well read and informed and had firm opinions about some of his colleagues and practices he had seen on the international circuit. The school was his second international posting but he was unsure about

his future on the international scene, telling me on a number of occasions he found it "a bit dull" and lacking in the day to day "rough and tumble of your average British comp."

I socialized the most with Teachers 4 and 5 outside of school and they both sent a good deal of email correspondence which they would follow up with visits to my room, telling stories and jokes. There was a sense during out interviews that I already knew their views and experiences, stories and insights and I found myself prompting them to speak for the benefit of the recording and analysis, which ultimately felt a little contrived. However, they both liked being transcribed and I made a conscious effort to capture their emotional vocabulary as much as possible, prompting them in the staffroom or on the corridor. Together with Teacher 1, Teachers 4 and 5 considered their PGCE and background in "proper" state schools in the UK to be "badges of honour" and had a general disdain for any international teachers who found discipline issues difficult to handle. I would use incidents I had seen on the corridor to prompt discussion, knowing they would respond with enthusiasm. However, it should be noted, despite their often critical comments towards colleagues, both teachers were consistently good natured throughout all our interactions and remain popular faces around the school.

Teacher 6: Female, American, an experienced classroom teacher but not ambitious beyond the head of department role she occupied at the time of the study. Similarly to Teacher 1, she provided mentoring for some of the younger teachers in the school in the form of a staffroom "agony aunt" but did not get involved in disputes between staff and administration. Teacher 6 was far more selective over her socializing with other teachers than Teacher 1. She was comfortable with the international lifestyle and saw herself teaching within it for many years. I had a fairly distant relationship with her. We had clashed over what I saw as Teacher 6's preference for academically strong female students over weaker male students and I was hoping to explore this further during our interviews. Teacher 6 clearly enjoyed popularity with certain students but was constantly criticized for what was seen as an elitist approach by other segments of the student population. However, she proved to be fairly unwilling to discuss those interpretations and experiences. I suspect it was due partly because she did not agree with my analysis or interventions I had conducted with two of her students.

Insider research

Insiders are located within a shared way of looking at the world which can be located within a world of professional practice (Scott et al., 2004). Organizational, professional and personal contexts all affect the way insider-research develops; *situated learning* (Lave, 1988) is not just in a location but is a socio-cultural cognitive activity positioned within context and is entirely related to it (Drake, 2011). Consequently, the multiple perspectives needed for understanding are provided in part by consideration of context (Costley, Elliot and Gibbs, 2010).

Insider research places the worksite as the primary location for learning rather than disciplinary knowledge (Barnett, 2003). Consequently, production of new forms of knowledge is apparent at each stage of insider projects as practitioners combine professional and technical knowledge with academic or analytical knowledge as part of an unfolding process (Hannabus, 2000; Costley, Elliot and Gibbs, 2010). Furthermore, insider research means the researcher must let go of the researcher-practitioner roles as it assumes a person is always separable from the role taken up and the insider researcher will be performing both roles at once (Hajer, 1995). Research undertaken by professionals in their field is shaped by professional and personal norms and it becomes difficult for researchers to stand apart from them.

Recently there has been an exponential rise in the amount of small-scale practitioner research in education. The emergence of the Doctorate in Education (Ed.D) raises important questions over data gathering as many EdD students complete their courses on a part-time basis whilst continuing with their regular employment (Mercer, 2006). Moreover, their own school or college often becomes the research site. However, discussion regarding insider research in educational institutions appears to be thin (Anderson and Jones, 2000; Labaree, 2002; Mercer, 2006) and tends to gloss over the intricacies of *insiderness* at one's place of work.

Part of the problem may lie with deciding what constitutes an insider. Insiders are members of specified groups or occupants of specified social statuses; outsiders are therefore the non-

members (Merton, 1972). The insider is someone whose biography (race, gender, socio-economic class, sexual orientation and so on) gives them a *lived familiarity* with the group being researched (Griffith, 1998). Such a position gives a high degree of subjectivity to the research which has been termed *subjective-objectivity* (Drake, 2011); the inclusion of personal identity allows us all to become multiple insiders and outsiders when conducting research (Deutsch, 1981) as the Venn diagrams of our personal history interject with the participants'. For example, Oakley (1981) asserts women interviewing other women enjoy a greater rapport, as a result of their shared experiences of womanhood. Consequently, *insiderness* has been seen on a continuum (e.g. Bulmer, 1982; Labaree, 2002; Carter, 2004) that may fluctuate during the course of one interview (Kelleher and Hillier, 1996). However, the boundaries between the two ends unstable, permeable and better understood in terms of conceptualization rather than fact (Mercer, 2006).

Considerations for the enquiry

I discuss considerations for the enquiry of insider research under the headings of *incidental data, familiarity* and *ethics.*

Incidental data: I decided to set up interviews with each participant and took a 'wait and see' approach to how much as well as the quality of the data I collected. The participants responded well to the interview atmosphere but then started emailing me or stopping me on the corridor with extra information or clarification. This led to questions over *incidental data.* Griffiths (1985) outlines how she chose not to use material from informal staffroom chats, or meetings with restricted access because the collection of these data had not been pre-negotiated. For her it was a betrayal of trust. A cautious approach was also favoured by Campbell (2002) who preferred using only data from direct personal conversations, rather than anything he overheard by chance. However, like Pollard (1985), Scott (1985) and Mercer (2006), I decided against such an overtly strict approach. I justify my position on a number of fronts: I did not hold any position of administrative responsibility over staff in institution where I worked; the participants were enthusiastic about providing more data, greater detail and clarity outside of the interview and appeared to have no real inhibitions about continuing the discussions outside of the formal interview; I did not intend to present my findings to

anyone at the school. It should be noted corridor openness was not the case for all the participants, Teachers 1, 2, 4 and 5 were the most willing to continue the discussions via email and staffroom chats.

Familiarity: Insiders have a better initial understanding of the social setting because they know the context and they understand the subtle and diffuse links between situations and events (Griffiths, 1985; Mercer 2006) and create confidence with the participants (Hockey, 1993). What is more debatable is whether this heightened familiarity and confidence leads to thicker description or greater verisimilitude (Hawkins, 1990; Mercer, 2006). Greater familiarity could render insiders more likely to take things for granted and assume their own perspective is far more widespread than it actually is; an obvious question might not be asked (Hockey, 1993); shared prior experiences might not be explored thoroughly (Powney and Watts, 1987, Kanuha, 2000) and therefore seemingly shared norms might not be articulated properly (Platt, 1981) and the data may be less rich as a consequence. I had an implicit understanding of this when discussing the area of student-teacher attraction with Teachers 4 and 5 who were the only male participants. They both wanted to share mechanisms of success they used to deal with the issue of being attracted to students. However, they did not want to demonstrate how this might be an on-going process or to confess any relapses. The converse was true with some of the female participants who wanted to share a naughty giggle over the high school pin up for a male audience and had fewer inhibitions about discussing a sexual element to their school reality. In this way, my gender outsiderness benefited the data gathering with the female teachers while my gender insiderness clearly inhibited it with the men.

For my part, particularly with Teachers 2 and 4, I was able to exploit personal information. For example: I knew Teacher 4 found one of the secretaries attractive and I knew Teacher 2 had previously experienced some difficulty on corridor duty. I also added to stories they told and while I am aware this can distract the interviewee (Platt, 1981; Powney and Watts, 1987) my sympathies lie with Cresswell (1996), Oakley (1981) and Logan (1984) who argue personal stories develop rapport and trust. However, it can also be noted I cannot describe a definitive interview strategy with regards disposition and personal conduct other than to say I

adopted an interview style that was as close to my natural personality and everyday interaction with the participants as possible and while this may have varied with each participant it was generated from instinct and, I admit, a lack researcher guile.

Ethics: As an insider researcher, I found myself developing my ethical perspectives as the research unfolded; continuously negotiating and re-negotiating my position vis-à-vis ethical dilemmas. For example, as noted above some of my participants wanted to discuss the sexual nature of their feelings in a school setting and while I decided their responses would provide rich data (benefitting me) I decided I did not want to pursue them for personal, professional and academic reasons: Sexual discussions surrounding schools do not sit comfortably with me personally; I did not want it discussed elsewhere in the school I was pursuing such a line in my research and I did not want the final enquiry to be characterized by sexual findings. It could be noted how my insiderness inhibited me at this point in data gathering as I am sure such an avenue of investigation would have produced rich data streams and further affective-emotional areas to explore.

Drake (2011) argues ethically sound research involves values and judgements that bring together the academic, the professional and the personal which lead to context specific and complex ethical positions. She highlights Flyvbjerg (2001) who states social science researchers tend to address four value-rational questions to guide them as they move through the research process:

- Where are we going?
- Is this development desirable?
  Who gains and who loses, and by which mechanism of power?
- What, if anything, should be done about it?
  (cited in and adapted from Drake, 2011)

Mercer (2006) argues there are primarily two ethical dilemmas facing the insider researcher. First, there is the issue of what to tell colleagues, both before and after they participate in the research. Powney and Watts (1987) argue that research benefits from interviewees being fully informed while Bulmer (1982) contends all field research must in some way involve

misinformation or even mild deceit. For my part, I needed to explain Hochschild's notions and explain the basic aim of the study. Further ethical assumptions were:

- Voluntary participation
- No physical or psychological harm to participants
- Integrity both in terms of the approach to participants and the data.
- PAC: Privacy, anonymity and confidentiality. I also took this to include the students, parents and colleagues they discussed, as well as previous employment. I deliberately withheld descriptive information about the school and the participants.

I received full, informed consent from the participants and gave them opportunity to ask questions about the nature of the study. There is a responsibility placed on the insider researcher to understand the ethical principles that exist in the place of research (Messick, Darley and Tyler, 2001). However, I also had a responsibility to myself to carry out research that subscribed to the normal ground rules of trust and reciprocity as a member of a social community (Griffiths, 1998). Consequently, I encountered a key problem with anonymity both from an institutional and individual level. The tight focus of the study would naturally lead to a research question that names the institution. For example:

"How do participants in [named school] make sense of their work environment through the lens of affective-emotional zones?"

However, I gave assurances to the director of the school that it would not be named *nor be identifiable* in the final report. I gave the same assurances to the participants and I was conscious it is not easy to lose people in a small qualitative crowd (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983). Therefore, with this in mind, the research question was affected by my ethical position and it became:

How do participants in a school make sense of their work environment through the lens of affective-emotional zones?

I accept the final research question is less accurate than it otherwise might be.

3.4. Data Collection and Analysis

In this section I outline my approach to the interviews and data.

Approach to the interviews

I either conducted the interviews in the participants' rooms or I invited them to my own room. Each initial interview lasted around two and a half hours per participant with follow-up via email and in person. I prepared summaries of Hochschild's notions and invited the participants to comment in the first person, constructing a self-report of their affective-emotional experiences. My own task during the course of the interview became an 'immediate transcriber'. I had not envisaged this as my role and I came about this by accident but this is in line with West (1996) who argues there is good reason to produce detailed field notes that approximate verbatim records of talk. My intention was to record the interviews and then transcribe later as I had done with previous social science research. However, maintaining eye contact with someone as they are recounting a personal event would often inhibit the length and depth of their retelling. During one interview I took a laptop and directly transcribed as the participant talked, although I attempted to maintain a jovial atmosphere it became too formal with the tapping of the keys a further distraction. I therefore used my notepad and wrote by hand. Writing by hand visibly pleased the participants and my response was to *write more often*. The participants seemed to enjoy the process of being reported on, and became more willing storytellers as a result. Therefore, all my interviews were conducted in this way, with all the participants clearly enjoying the experience of having their stories transcribed in front of them. The process was also useful in masking the recording of impressions of the participants conduct during the interaction, as in the previous instance they became conscious if I wrote down when they were being sarcastic for example, because I was now writing all the time. This became especially useful for detailing humour and sarcasm and citing their conversations in a meaningful behavioural context (Rosenthal and Rosnow, 1969; Baumesiter, 1982; West, 1996).

The interviews were recorded with a tape recorder and played back immediately after the interview where I transcribed any data I had not managed to write down during the interview. The interviews were not then transcribed via word processing en masse, as I had such a rich

immediate resource with my hand written notes, and much of what the participants were saying was not immediately relevant to my study. Where relevant stories became cumbersome and intricate (which happened often) I would refer myself to the tape and then transcribe later. I used a structured interview sheet which I transcribed directly onto for each interview. I also maintained a reflexive journal throughout the project to record thought bursts and follow data themes to enhance the data interpretation stage (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Harding, 1991) this was also present in the interviews.

Active interviewing

I was predominantly interested in teachers' *relations with themselves* through their association with affective-emotional experiences, techniques, routines and assemblages in their work spaces. An ecological approach allows feelings and emotions to be defined *by context* and to describe them is to name our way of seeing something, an *apprehended reality* in relation to the self (Hochschild, 1983). Display and feeling rules allow teachers to reflect and experience aspects of themselves *in role*. They are a form of impression management whereby the enactor is aware of the affective-emotional repertoires they use to achieve their goals; a sentient, feeling self, capable of seeing the self as a subjective state, one that can be evaluated and described in affective-emotional terms (Hochschild, 2003).

My view of affective emotional zones is that they offer scope for attended space; breaking the school environment into affective-emotional units of analysis. The act of naming places importance on how individuals describe their feelings and emotions and such a position compels the researcher to take an interest in how the participants describe their affective-emotional states and the researcher ultimately takes an interest in the vocabulary the participant uses to outline their inner worlds (Grove and Fisk, 1989; Parkinson, 1991); the *emotional vocabulary* in the Hochschild (2003) sense. I argue such a position promotes and offers insight on the repertoires of personhood; how human beings come to relate to themselves *as selves*.

People have access to a great deal of their own experiences, but their experiences are not always available to public view. Therefore, data gathered for studying experiences needs to consist of first-person or self-reports (Polkinghorne, 2005). Furthermore, I wanted an

approach that would allow me to utilize my natural interest in stories to uncover the nuances of peoples' lives (Elbaz, 1991; Polkinghorne, 1995) and capture the specificity and interconnectedness of teaching (Carter, 1993). Encouraging participants to tell stories forces the researcher to take an interest in often mundane events which they might otherwise take for granted (Grumet, 1976; Bruner, 1986; Carter and Doyle, 1987) and situate the teacher in their environment. Furthermore, self-reporting though storytelling can become an *emancipatory act*, allowing teachers to express themselves within their own natural avenues of communication (Gough, 1997). Active interviewing gives the researcher the freedom to approach each participant's personal circumstances and then encourage them to tell stories and encourage them to shift perspectives; a useful approach when researching feelings and emotions.

I also wanted to utilize the human tendency to think in terms of images (Turner, 1999) during the research process and encourage the participants to 'picture' actual places in their environment, without us physically walking through the school. Images prompt discussion, provide context and aid narrative construction. To this end I drew a map of a generic school featuring geographical spaces, which I considered potent in terms of feelings and emotions as well as being in existence in my case study school; classrooms, corridors, a foyer, libraries, toilets.

With these considerations in mind, the *active interview* (Gubrium and Holstein, 1995) became a natural approach as it allows the interview to become a productive site for creating meaning where the participants are constantly developing their version of affective-emotional events. During active interviewing, the aim of the interviewer is to encourage personal relevancies, prompt interpretative possibilities, facilitate narrative linkages, suggest alternative perspectives and appreciate diverse horizons of meaning. My approach allows these to take place through an affective-emotional lens. Gubrium and Holstein (1995) do not see it as a distinctive method, more as an inventory of considerations and as an implicit theory of interview.

Active interviewing includes the notions of conceptualization and positioning whereby the

researcher cannot tell the participant what to say, but they can offer ways of looking at particular phenomena pertinent to the research question. I wanted to introduce the participants with Hochschild's work including her definitions of display and feeling rules and my own notion of affective-emotional heresy to enrich the discussions and provide greater focus and clarity. To the uninitiated they can be complex and unwieldy but I did not want to work from a position where I could be accused as having exclusive access to meaning (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1983) Furthermore, I wanted my participants to be informed and be able to talk about their feelings and emotions in the context of the problem space but also interact with me and the philosophical framework of the study. I also wanted to utilize the human tendency to think in terms of images (Turner, 1999) during the research process and encourage the participants to 'picture' actual places in their environment, without us physically walking through the school. The use of a map could also be considered a form of positioning but active interviewing suggests images prompt discussion, provide context and aid narrative construction.

The inventory offered by Gubrium and Holstein (1995) further includes:

- Use of background knowledge: The researcher is encouraged to bring their own experience to the research process in the interview and beyond. There is the further notion of *securing communion* with the respondents whereby the interviewer can interject into the interview process to explore topics of mutual interest, promote rapport and encourage elaboration. Consequently, I was able to discuss joint experiences with my participants and offer ways of looking at events. I was a colleague as well as a researcher (discussed further below) and we shared a work environment therefore it became a much more natural discussion, although I was cautious about the potential to direct their responses.
- Indigenous Coding: Coding takes place and unfolds as an integral part of the interview process not just beforehand or afterward. Therefore, I was allowed to start thinking about coding and data structure during the interviews and let those considerations inform the interviews as they progressed.

- The Importance of Multivocality: Respondents should be encouraged to shift narrative positions within the interview, encouraging them to describe phenomena from another's point of view. I was able to ask the participants about other staff members. Such a method forced them to consider other's feeling and emotions. It also brought to the surface the recurring theme of a staff member who was seen as breaching expected norms.

Interview schedule

My interviews changed according to the data I collected in earlier stages and allowed for any eventuality the participants wanted to discuss. I used Hochschild's notions to drive the questioning such as: What is happening in terms of display? How are you feeling? What should you be feeling? Have you ever felt differently? What should *not* be feeling?

For example:

Here we are in the staffroom. What do you normally do here? Does anything annoy you about this place? How often do you go here? How do you feel when you are in here?

I referred to the map of the school and a verbal storyboarded expectation of where I wanted them to begin and where I wanted them to end. I set up point A's and point B's (an action plan) in the dialogue as well as pointing to the map and I wanted my participants to imagine moving between them, verbalizing their feelings and emotions as they travelled.

I want you to walk from here to your classroom.

Then I would quiz them disrupting their action plans for the imagined journey (a *meaning block*), complicating the narrative that the participant had expected to deliver.

It is right at the end of break. Kids are on the corridor. Some are going to class, others are lingering. What do you do? What do you say to those who don't move right away? What is your usual response?

I was influenced by Strauss and Corbin (1998) in my conscious choosing of questions that deliberately shifts the point of view of the teller.

For example:
What is going on (issues, problems, concerns)? Who are the other teachers? How do they define the situation? What is its meaning to them? What are they doing? How does this impact your behaviour? How should they be acting? What do you think they are feeling?

I wanted the participants to reflect on what they should have been doing (display rules) by outlining what other teachers did or did not do. When they had described the conduct of other members of staff or students I asked:

How does that make you feel? How does that impact how you do your job?

I was often searching for the participants' primary tasks as they conducted school tasks as teachers. The primary task can be defined as the task any group must perform if it is to survive as a group when confronted with psychological conflict associated with the group (Bion, 1961; Stokes, 1994). Analysis of the primary task, therefore allows insight into the affective-emotional life of any group (Miller and Rice, 1967 cited in Roberts, 1994). It has been seen as an oversimplification (e.g. Roberts, 1994) but it can provide a valuable starting point.

Data Analysis

There were two stages to the analysis:

1. To characterize the affective-emotional responses of teachers as they moved through areas of the school and decide whether there was enough evidence to postulate the notion of affective-emotional zones with demarcated display and feeling and heretical rules.

The principle method of analysis I used was Open Coding based on Grounded Theory

outlined by Strauss and Corbin (1998). It is worth noting, I was searching for *characterizing* the display, feeling and heretical rules and not sorting through the data at a deeper level to let these categories emerge 'themselves'. I may be seen as distorting one of the basic tenets of the Grounded Theory outlined by Strauss and Corbin (1998) who argue that theory should emerge *from* data without a preconceived notion of the theory on the part of the researcher. My distortion is such that I had already bracketed the notions of display, feeling and heretical rules (and made this clear to my participants) and therefore I am searching for teacher descriptions and narrative forms within these contexts. However, Strauss and Corbin do allow researchers to follow this distorted pattern as long as they are elaborating or extending "existing theory" (1998: 12). They also highlight the creativity of the researcher in adapting methods to suit their aims as one of the strengths of Grounded Theory ("[T]hese procedures were not designed to be followed dogmatically but rather to be used creatively and flexibly by researchers as they deem appropriate": 13). Given the philosophical underpinnings of the affective-emotional constructs I outlined in my literature review and philosophical underpinnings, the project falls well within the spirit and aims of Grounded Theory as it encourages researchers to aptly name categories, ask stimulating questions, make comparisons, and extract an innovative and realistic scheme from the masses of unorganized raw data (Strauss and Corbin, 1998).

I also accept that my coding practices represent a shallow use of open coding (in the sense that I am not using it to the full extent that it can be used and to the extent that I have used it in past social science research) but I am still searching for *meaning* within data (one of the key aims of Grounded Theory), but I leans more towards *descriptive* meaning rather than analytical.

To merge categories and choose appropriate descriptive words from the data to describe my central categories/descriptions of the affective-emotional zones, I used the following criteria:

1. It must be central; that is, all other major categories can be related to it.
2. It must appear frequently in the data. This means that within all or almost all cases, there are indicators pointing to that concept.

3. The explanation that evolves by relating the categories is logical and consistent. There is no forcing of data.
4. The name or phrase used to describe the central category should be sufficiently abstract that it can be used to do research in other substantive areas, leading to the development of a more general theory.

(Strauss and Corbin, 1998: 147).

For example:

Not all teachers used the word 'anxiety' or 'anxious' to describe the corridors at break time. However, I chose to utilize this word as it was used a great deal (by Teachers 3 and 6) or referred to in the context of behaviour. Therefore, in some areas I made an assumption behavioural displays represent actual feelings – what they described doing became what they were feeling. Teachers were very clear about how they avoided corridor chaos during break time. Teachers 1-4 and 6 outlined affective-emotional routines to demonstrate they did not want to be part of student interactions. However, in the case of Teacher 5, he outlined how he deliberately interacted with students during break time because not doing so was considered rude. Therefore, I was able to infer Teacher 5 feeling rudeness caused him anxiety and was able to place his feeling in the same category as the other teachers (anxiety) even though his display rule was different. In some cases, I am aware of the failure on my part to uncover raw feeling. However, during interview, constantly pushing for "what were you feeling?" halted the flow and even when they attempted to describe their inner worlds, they often reverted to their behavioural displays. It accounts for the behavioural descriptions in the results and the inconsistencies in detail between feelings and emotions.

2. To characterize and identify the challenges within affective-emotional zones.

To uncover challenges teachers faced within affective-emotional zones I used critical event coding as proffered by Webster and Mertova (2007). An event becomes critical if it has impacted on the *performance* of the individual in a professional or work related role (Woods, 1993a; Webster and Mertova, 2007). A critical event is almost always a change in experience,

usually (but not always) a conflict between belief and experience (Measor, 1985; Fay, 2000). They can be further sub-divided:

- A *critical* event: An event selected because of its unique, illustrative and confirmatory nature.
- A *like* event: An event on the same sequence level as a critical event, which serves to further confirm and repeat the experience of the critical event.
- An *other* event: Further events that take place at the same time as the critical and like events but are not deemed as unique or illustrative enough to the researcher and/or teller.

I was able to identify *critical, like* and *other* events and some were explored further as they took my interest and some were discarded as I moved through the process of analysis. Some examples include: The description of the girls in the bathroom by Teacher 2 and the description of the school foyer by Teacher 1. Some critical events were more obvious than others, the description of the summer camp by Teacher 5 as well as his treatment by one of his own teachers and the effect it had on his teaching practices was an easy narrative thread to snip as it was so thought provoking for me (as it had been for him), but his description of how he approached the fax machine in the office was less prominent to me until I started to consider whether this should be seen as a *critical, like* or *other* event.

3.5. Credibility/validity

Insider research is characterized by usefulness and application even though it may not transfer exactly to another work based situation (Costley, Elliot and Gibbs, 2010). Researching in a familiar situation from a professional position may mean an enhanced ability to gauge the honesty and accuracy of colleagues' responses (Drake, 2011). However, Hammersley (1993) asserts while no position can guarantee valid knowledge, no position prevents it either. Therefore, a reflexive stance is vital to construct a justifiable and authentic defence of a research position shot through with integrity and authenticity; placing oneself squarely in the frame of research and considering explicitly what that means for validity of the project (Usher, 2000). Lather (1993) positions validity as "a space of constructed visibility of the

practices of methodology" (: 674), enabling research to scrutinize its own methods of making meaning. She argues research as a means of critical reflection is a worthwhile process and, among other questions, encourages researchers to ask:

- Did I encourage ambivalence and multiplicity or did I impose order and structure?
- What has been muted, repressed or unheard?
- Did I focus on the limits of my own conceptions?
- How was this work tied into the demands of my academic career?
  (cited in and adapted from Drake, 2011).

Discrepant evidence: Edwards and Furlong (1985) maintain the major criterion for external validity is for presenting the researcher's account back to the researched and ask for further comment. Therefore, to be valid, an account must *converge* with the experience of the researched and agreed consensus regarding reality must be reached. However, such a position fails to address how the perspectives of participants change over time, contradict each other and be ambivalent (Silverman, 2000). For example, Teacher 5 gradually revealed his experiences to me over a lengthy period of time (5- 6 weeks) and clarified some points via email. I had to construct a working narrative of the events he had told me and then go back to him and question him further. I disregarded his earlier responses about the summer camp which had been dismissive and concentrated on his more considered response in a non-structured environment in his classroom at lunchtime. I wanted to conceptualize an affective-emotional snapshot of the participants' school experiences and in keeping with Silverman (2000) chose not to present their responses back to them.

During interview and analysis I sought discrepant accounts. One approach I used was to seek *multivocality* whereby participants are encouraged to shift narrative positions within the interview and describe phenomena from another's point of view (Gubrium and Holstein, 1995). For example, I would ask: "*How do you think (another teacher) acts or feels in these spaces? Why do you think that is?"* There were two spaces that were dropped from analysis because of discrepant accounts (although I have included some details in the data presentation chapter); the car park and sports field. I could not find enough affective-emotional

commonality to warrant their inclusion with some teachers unable to answer (e.g. Teacher 6 used a driver who waited for her outside of the school gates so she did not visit the car park) and other participants giving interesting although contradictory accounts (e.g. Teacher 2 "hated" the sports field but she could not tell me when she had spent any time there). Initially, the sports field was included in the same zone as the corridors (student owned during break time) but the evidence was too thin or discrepant.

Iterative questioning: I revisited descriptions throughout the interview using differently worded questions.

Examples include:

- The classroom was identified as a teacher owned space ("it's mine" was a frequent refrain) so I asked how they felt and acted when the space was used by another teacher or used during the weekend.

- The act of emailing was often framed into an explicit question ("*Tell me how you approach emailing…").* However, if the participant told a story about a parent or student I would ask if they had emailed them and what form the interaction took.

- If a teacher told a story about an incident involving a parent, teacher or student I asked them how they would feel and act if they saw the individuals in the corridor or cafeteria.

I was therefore able to keep the participants focused on their feelings and emotions in various and I built up a collection of affective-emotional accounts for spaces around the school but from different narrative viewpoints.

I engaged in *member checking* as the interview unfolded (Miles and Huberman, 1994). *Member checking* involves verification of the investigator's emerging theories and inferences as these were formed during the dialogues. For example, I asked, "*So, the corridors can be a place where you feel anxious during break time*?" I would then re-check with rephrased

iterative question such as: "*And you don't feel that way during class time when the corridors are empty? How do you approach a student on the corridor during class time? Do you approach them at all? How do you feel when you do this? How do these feelings impact on your behaviour?"* Further examples of strategies I used for the constant comparison of data and emerging themes included the keeping of a thematic log during the group discussion and constantly writing marginal remarks during interview and transcript reading and keeping detailed researcher field journal notes (Tuckett and Stewart, 2004a).

I was then tasked with choosing a description that most reflected the participant's affective-emotional experience. I did this by making sure the affective-emotional description I chose could be centralized with all other descriptions they used. For example: If I chose a category of 'anxiety' surrounding the corridor at a certain time I had to be sure the participant's alternative descriptions could also be considered to be describing 'anxiety'. Furthermore, the final description must have appeared frequently in the data in either actual form or a related reference. For example, Teacher 2 spoke about the corridors at her previous school in the same responses as the corridors of the study school. However, I was able to note the affective-emotional consistency over the two locales. Finally, I placed an emphasis on consistency and did not 'force' the data (Strauss and Corbin, 1998) and I was able to note the discrepancies in the data presentation and discussion chapter.

The presentation of the physical floor plan: I made use of a generalized map of the school in my interviews that allowed teachers to think more clearly in terms of school spaces and produced clearer modes of thought. I understand focusing the participants on a generic model of the school may have lost potential nuances of the participants' perception of school spaces however I was influenced by Gubrium and Holstein's broader notion of *analytical bracketing* (2009). Analytical bracketing allows the researcher to begin analysis at the starting point of research (in this case, Hochschild's basic notions and my initial ideas about viewing schools as institutions through the lens of affective-emotional constructs and geographical areas, through to the interviews themselves, their analysis and the construction of my conclusions) with the procedural goal of shifting the analytic focus to where it is considered appropriate during and after the interview process. I was also aware the use of imagery can begin to

unlock a participant's view of their environment by opening up a more natural state of thinking (Turner, 1999). Therefore, while I may have lost some nuances of teachers' descriptions, I gained an ability to focus the participants and make it easier for them to relate their reports to places.

The introduction of Hochschild's notions: Gubrium and Holstein (1995) outlined their notions of conceptualization and positioning whereby the researcher cannot tell the participant what to say, but they can offer ways of looking at particular phenomena pertinent to the research question. It allows the researcher to demarcate a particular perspective such as providing definitions for the phenomena being studied. Hochschild's notions provide the conceptual framing for my study. The notions were introduced to the participants at an early stage in the interview. I did not expect the participants to relate all their stories using Hochschild's vocabulary but I accept, my inclusion of them in during interview had allowed a conceptual positioning to take place.

An alternative would have been to allow participants to discuss their feelings and emotions without *any* framework. Such an approach is tempting, however I always intended to discuss my results in the context of display and framing rules as I had deliberately framed feelings and emotions within that context. Therefore, it was a natural progression for me to generate data with them. Display and feeling rules represent *ways of looking* at feelings and emotions in the workplace and give clarity and foundation and while I may be criticized for providing too much conceptual framing it proved to be a valuable tool for investigating feelings and emotions within the time that I had with the participants. A further unforeseen advantage was that framing feelings and emotions within the context of display and feeling rules made it easier for participants to discuss their personal experiences as they were no longer discussing their feelings and emotions but feeling and display rules.

The conceptual framing also "felt right" (Drake, 2011: 29). I did not want to approach the descriptions of feelings and emotions with a frame of mind that asked, 'Ah, but what are they *really* feeling?' The feeling rules and display rule framework provides a level of honesty between myself and my participants that respects the participants' ability to understand the

context for the study while at the same time accepting they might be more inclined to discuss their feelings and emotions if they were framed through a particular academic lens.

Given the threat to validity from my conceptual positioning I also internalized an ethical approach to the data as follows:

- Categories were formed based on data that was central to the participant or the concepts they were outlining.
- Categories formed as a result of merging were related to the original concept.
- Concepts appeared frequently in the data. This means that within all or almost all cases, there were indicators pointing to the concepts.
- The explanations that evolved by relating the categories were logical and consistent. There was no forcing of data.

Extensive use of participant voices: To achieve trustworthiness with the data, exemplars, field notes and extensive quotations were used to help the reader understand the context of the re-telling (Mishler, 1990; Ricoeur, 1992; Carter, 1993; Amsterdam and Bruner, 2000; Webster and Mertova, 2007). Utilizing participants' voices in this way represents a form of narrative cognition as it allows an openness in the data to reveal an explanatory knowledge of why a person acted the way they did (Polkinghorne, 1995). Participant stories give cohesion and context to potentially un-wieldy data fields and encourage the researcher to form a considerate position with regards language (Berger and Luckman 1966; Eagleton, 1996). Within such approaches the participants own untidy expression of their feelings and emotions is utilized as a valid form of representation and ultimately, a more modest position is created for the social scientist (Willis, 1980; Habermas, 1987). It should be noted: Although self-report evidence is necessary and valuable for inquiry about human experience, individuals cannot be seen as having complete access to their experiences. The capacity to be aware of or to recollect one's experiences is intrinsically limited (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998; Polkinghorne, 2005).

3.6. Working with the Literature

In the following section I outline how I approached sources and constructed my philosophical underpinnings. I describe the parameters I set myself for the literature critiquing process and

justify why they were used.

Literature review

I wanted my Literature Review to critique the core assumptions without causing the reader to question whether they exist as viable concepts. I saw my role as articulating the intellectual lineage behind my study, albeit through a critical lens and not as a devil's advocate for each and every position. I identified the key areas as Hochchilds' notions and an ecological approach to space. I deliberately sought literature that either supported or advanced them within new paradigms.

My first task was to identify a working definition for feelings and emotions. A key problem with educational literature was a lack of a clear vision for the concepts. Often internal affect (feelings) is used interchangeably with behavioural expression (emotions). Reductionist approaches such as the most recent work by Hartley and Phelps (2010) offer clarity but are rooted in physiology. Teaching is action centred so I excluded approaches that leaned towards intangibility and embraced those that favoured concise definitions such as Forgas (1992) and Fineman (1993). The emotions-environment dynamic was appropriate as it posits emotions as deterministic behavioural forces in the social landscape and this dovetailed into my interest in *emotional labour* and how feelings and emotions impact workplaces.

Other affective-emotional concepts such as Emotional Literacy (Steiner, 1997), Emotional Dissonance (Hochschild, 1983) and Social identity theory within the organization (Ashforth and Mael, 1989) were considered but rejected as being peripheral to my central topic although they formed a key part of my intellectual journey. Furthermore, I originally critiqued Emotional and Social Intelligence (Goleman, 1998; 2006) and while I accepted Allen and Cohen's view (2006) that EI has intuitive value, there are serious flaws with the concept as a durable research paradigm and it came to represent a vestige of my personal trajectory to the topic rather than contribute to the eventual framework that was orientated around Hochschild's central notions of display and feeling rules within emotional labour.

I wanted to posit feelings and emotions as socio-dynamic forces capable of enacting change and being influenced by the social milieu. I aimed to discuss feelings and emotions in the

context of schools and I also wanted to broaden the discussion beyond education literature into the broader concept of institutions and their affective-emotional energy needed to be briefly addressed. There are vestiges of my intellectual route with the inclusion of Bion (1961), Klein and de Riviere (1974), Hirschhorn (1988), Mawson, (1994) Stokes (1994) and Jacques (1995). However, my overriding aim was to introduce Hochschild's notions and discuss them in the context of schools and space. I wanted to include Hochschild's voice as she developed the concept over 25 years. I limited the critiquing process to those who chose to accept the basic tenets of *emotional labour* (e.g. Grandey, 2000) and who advanced ideas within it. I sought work to support Hochschild's notion and advance it, rather than be seen to dismiss it and then have to justify why it is viable.

My own concept of affective-emotional zones is dependent on spaces being defined by *who* is using them, *how* and *when.* The new approach to space presents a challenge to the writer as it is potentially unwieldy given the philosophical underpinnings. For the section I chose an established position Valsiner's (2005) symbolic actions and generalized meaning fields and Proshansky et al.'s (1983) notions of place identity to establish space as resonating with affect to influence identity and meaning creation. I wanted to emphasize how human relations with space are influenced by *movement* and I included a small section on driving a car to emphasise how the act of moving through space can be a profoundly embodied and sensuous experience (Urry, 2000).

Philosophical framework

My approach to pedagogy and my general philosophical assumptions led me to phenomenological human science research as part of my intellectual journey and I was influenced by three key characteristics: Primarily, I was interested in teaching via a series of actions that focus the researcher on the meaning and nature of everyday experiences (Marcel, 1949; Gadamer, 1986) as well as the stated aim of asking the participants to consider their affective-emotional resources (Bollnow, 1994, although it is only termed 'emotional resourcefulness'). Furthermore, as an experienced teacher I was conscious my participants were *experts* in the practical act of teaching; a phenomenological approach acts as a reminder to the researcher that they do not have exclusive access to meaning (Dreyfus and Rabinow,

1983) as it posits the participants at the centre of the process.

I was offering a detailed examination of experiences and actions in one setting, using my own perception to interpret situations rapidly as well as revising interpretations in the light of experience which renders the enquiry redolent of the case study approach (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982; Stenhouse, 1985). Data collection in a case study includes; observations, interviews, as well as impression and intuition (Wellington, 2000). The problems usually associated with the case study approach are the extent to which generalization is occurring by the researcher and the notion of validity (Yin, 1994). I take the view that even if case studies cannot be used to produce generalizations they can at least be used to *explore* them and develop insight as a result (Mitchell, 1983, Wolcott, 1995). The potential for generalization often lies in the interpretation, abstraction and in the contribution to theory. Furthermore, the inherent richness of data a case study produces allows the researcher multiple interpretations by allowing personal experiences to inform the work and serve multiple audiences (Roizen and Jepson, 1985).

The case study approach places an emphasis on the environmental niche with the individual and environment as a system in the context of each other and it shifts the attention of the researcher onto what individuals *need to know* about their environment to function. Objections to such an approach are rooted in animal-environmental dualism as animal-environmental dualism raises the question of *how* the environment is measured and whether the resulting measurement can be then be compared to the individual's perception of the environment (Michaels and Carello, 1979; Turvey and Shaw, 1979). Therefore, the individual's perception of their environment is minimized as part of the research process as it enters into the equation as *the* environment, distinct and neutral from the organisms inhabiting it. My adoption of a direct perception approach allowed me to reject animal-environmental dualism and focus on individuals *knowing* their environmental niche as a system through an affective-emotional lens. Thus, if the teacher is the knower and the school is the known, one cannot be described without the other; a complete description of a school describes the teacher that occupies it; a complete description of a teacher describes their niche/school.

Chapter 4 – Data Presentation

The Data Presentation chapter is presented via the 6 teachers. I discuss their responses in the context of my research questions

> How do participants in a school make sense of their work environment through the lens of affective-emotional zones?
>
> How are affective-emotional zones characterized in terms of display rules and feeling rules?
>
> What challenges do teachers face when they are in particular affective-emotional zones and why?

Teacher 1

How does Teacher 1 make sense of her work environment through the lens of affective-emotional zones?

How are the affective-emotional zones outlined by Teacher 1 characterized in terms of display rules and feeling rules?

What challenges does Teacher 1 face in particular affective-emotional zones and why?

Teacher 1 enjoyed a sense of drama about the school building and was quick to act out emotional routines she followed. Her responses were quick, usually witty and with little apparent forethought. Teacher 1 was very clear about her affective-emotional shifts in certain areas of the school. She had a background in drama and could describe in detail her display rules and how these were connected to her feeling rules. She outlined a series of unusual performance repertoires:

> *I do my Prince Charles hands behind my back, and my Clint Eastwood long slow gait, I look focused like a sniper on a roof, cautious but shit scared.*

She was aware of the high pressure nature of the corridors during break time when she would "disconnect" and "switch off" allowing her exaggerated display rules to do the work for her; an elaborate ritual of ignoring the students to be above the fracas and not allow herself to intervene and discipline students during break time. If she was on duty she would try and

ignore the students and would only intervene in instances involving misbehaviour if became necessary (such as becoming too boisterous or dangerous).

Teacher 1 saw the school very much through a dramaturgical lens. For example: The staffroom contained some bland wall pictures which Teacher 1 "hated". She waited until the staffroom was empty and then hid the pictures ("I hate those shit pictures, I took them down and fucking hid them"). This can be seen as act to stage manage the territory, creating a certain atmosphere. She knew that removing the pictures in full view of everyone would have indicated dominance by the individual (a heretical act) and so it was carried out surreptitiously. Her other allusions to seeing the school through a stage lens came when she described the area outside of the office:

> *It was quiet at first, but now it's like John and Yoko sitting in bed in Amsterdam…there's two forces doing battle, you've got the office staff working away and then you have the school slackers* (meaning students) *slouching all over the couches, its actually quite amusing, the kids are sometimes shagging* (this does not literally happen) *and then you have school admin barking out orders…it's a school scene, a school scene (repeated).*

But there were underlying feeling rules of anger around public spaces such as the cafeteria and the office. Behaviour violations threw into relief the failures of the staff and an annoyance if the students were not performing their own roles properly:

> *We allow the kids to make cocks of themselves, we don't help them, we don't do them any favours, letting them sit around like that, legs over the arm rests, leering at passers-by, it's like the Bada Bing* (the bar and Mafia hang out in the Sopranos TV Series).

Teacher 1 changed her routines accordingly, ignoring students on the corridor and outside the office and in the cafeteria and even eating earlier to avoid feeling angry. The corridors during break time, foyer and cafeteria were areas where she did not assert display rules of authority

despite taking pride in her authoritarian displays in other areas (such as the classroom) and other times (such as the corridors after lessons had started) . Teacher 1 "loved the library…being among the books," and sought refuge to "ignore everyone" even though she knew it was a public space (in the sense that many parents occupied the space at the same time) it gave her a break from the areas where she felt "high pressure."

Teacher 1's description of her classroom was immediate and typically dramatic: "It's mine. I own it." She was more willing to discuss her display and feeling rules for the classroom and stated:

> *[My husband] would lock me up in a nunnery if he knew sometimes what I was thinking.*

The sexual energy in this statement is indicative of her bantering in the staffroom and she claimed "fancying the boys" was not either unusual or a serious feeling rule. She went onto outline how the classroom was a space for affective-emotional control which she took pride in. Her approach to her classroom can be contrasted with her hands off approach to the corridor and the cafeteria during break time and lunch time. Her emails were often "long and wordy" that she "loved" writing; she was confident expressing herself and frequently took work home (writing to students and marking work).

In sum: Teacher 1 outlined a keen awareness of her own feelings and emotions in the context of school spaces. She was willing to discuss inappropriate feelings, mocking and shedding light on the "teacher condition". She was confident in her own displays and self-aware of her feelings. Teacher 1 saw the school through a dramaturgical/performer lens and enjoyed the opportunities for emotional displays such as being on duty on the corridors or teaching her lessons. Teacher 1's challenges included regulating intense feelings of anger as well as avoiding interfering too much in school social affairs as exemplified by her need to remove and add staff pictures surreptitiously. In many ways she cast herself as a 'stage manager' arranging props

and becoming annoyed when other players were not doing as she expected. Teacher 1 was also very clear about her sexual feelings, "fancying the boys" was a normal state of affairs for her and she regulated these feelings (which she did not regard as heretical) to stop them becoming heretical emotions.

Teacher 2

How does Teacher 2 make sense of her work environment through the lens of affective-emotional zones?

How are the affective-emotional zones outlined by Teacher 2 characterized in terms of display rules and feeling rules?

What challenges does Teacher 2 face in particular affective-emotional zones and why?

Teacher 2s' responses were often uncertain. She was thoughtful and considered but had some trouble describing her emotional routines although she had little difficulty describing her feelings. She usually thought for long periods before giving her responses. In some ways, her descriptions suggested she searched for affective-emotional 'cocoons' in school spaces where she would feel more secure. For example: She mentioned she used the toilets when the students did so and so I pushed her to address why she deliberately sought this area out:

> *I talk to the girls in there…they put on their make-up, I talk to them, they can see you in a different light, I mean we are all biological beings, it's fun. It's a pretty social area, I don't feel I have control, I am just one of the girls, I take my teacher hat off. It's my job to help them, so I don't see it as a bad thing. It's not a formal environment at all. I am just one of the girls.*

She was aware that her behaviour may be seen as unorthodox and, typically, there was a certain amount of anxiety associated with a major incident occurring:

> *You know, if there's a fight and you have to report it, and you have to start off with, "Well I was in the toilets and they started scrapping", you obviously prefer that it would happen on the corridor or somewhere less personal.*

Another example of Teacher 2 searching for a clearly demarcated affective-emotional cocoon is in her description of the staffroom: A fuzzball table was introduced by a PE teacher who donated it to the staffroom when he left the school. Games became a regular fixture and caused disruptions in the group. The noise was an issue for Teacher 2 (from cheering, occasional swearing and the sound of the ball rolling around and being hit) but she also argued the group being fragmented as not all teachers were interested in the leagues that were set up. It became apparent that some teachers complained to admin and had the table removed. The table removal is discussed openly in the staffroom but it is not revealed who made the complaints. Her description contains very clear heretical feelings, "I hated that fuzzball table, hated it, it created a din, it was a nightmare. We got our staffroom back when they took it away"

Teacher 2 lacked confidence in the public areas of the library where she felt "on display" as there "is always some kind of parent meeting going on" and yet in contrast to Teacher 1, she saw the very public space of the cafeteria as a place where she could build relationships with students and did not feel the same levels of anxiety as she sought out student groups to interact with:

> *Cos eating is quite an intimate act isn't it? I mean, it's personal, and the kids see you doing it, it reminds them we are human, there are rules but at the same time, it's kind of a break from the school day isn't it…you are gonna sit there for quite a while and have a giggle.*

Teacher 2 had a very subtle approach to student relations and stayed away from public displays of student-teacher interaction I suspect partly due to her lack of desire for promotion. She ran an after school club in her classroom but this was not advertised through the usual methods and some teachers did not know she did this. Her classroom strategies for her subject included a series of complex card games. She was proud of these methods and her classroom was a space she *shared* with her students, inviting them and working with them. Teacher 2 had "small spaces" arranged around her room where students would sit and play the games

during her classes. She would sit with them on their physical level (sometimes the students use cushions on the floor) and play the games. Her approach can be contrasted with Teacher 1's more aggressive spatial awareness and dominance. It should be noted: Teacher 2 still felt she owned the classroom ("my room is very quiet compared to some peoples'…"). Her subtle approaches resulted in anger and guilt when a new principal articulated how he wanted to see more teachers talking with students on the corridor:

> *[Administrators name] wants us to be nice and chatty but I feel guilty…I don't honestly know what he wants but it seems like he thinks we have negative relations with students, and I feel miffed about being told I have to go and talk with them.*

For Teacher 2, the corridors where a place of clear anxiety and rather than show confident display roles she tended to avoid them at certain times:

> *There is definitely a fear factor, I mean, they are a lot bigger than me, they loom over you. They're scary.*

Teacher 2 also related how when she is on duty on the corridors she, "methodically go round each kid and talks [to] them" and she made a head movement to indicate that she was nodding at individual students "ticking them off" on a list of things to do on a conveyer belt of affective-emotional interaction:

> *I don't like it, I know it's part of my job to go down and interact but I resent being told to do it, I feel guilty if I feel I am not doing it enough, so I make the effort to talk to each one, it feels forced…*

As I noted above, Teacher 2 actively seeks out student groups in the cafeteria to interact with, Her feeling rules of frustration (caused by the principal) and feeling rules of anxiety (caused by the mere presence of students on the corridor) and guilt (caused by the principal instructing teachers to engage with the students) were transformed into a methodical emotional

interaction, a robotic routine but were not the result of anxiety over her own abilities. However, Teacher 2 was also confused as to exactly what display rules were required and the extent to which they were supposed to be implemented.

Teacher 2 also had anxiety over email interaction with students and parents which resulted in her adopting strict routines to avoid problems ("I try and keep them short. I probably over react to be honest and be really formal…").

In sum: Teacher 2 had a great deal of self-assuredness in spaces she felt in control of. These included her classroom, tables in the cafeteria and the toilets. However, in areas where she felt anxiety (the corridors during break time and email interaction) she had definitive affective-emotional routines that reduced the amount of affective-emotional work she had to engage in. For example: she effectively did not venture out during break times and her emails were short and formal. Teacher 2 lacked confidence in public areas and was unsure of the official display rules as mandated by the principal which caused her anxiety. Consequently, she engaged in methodical emotional displays to fulfil her obligations to avoid feeling guilty for not doing what she had been asked. Teacher 2 sought to create affective-emotional zones in spaces around the school that were not apparent as demarcated physical spaces and her challenge was to maintain these in areas (such as the cafeteria).

Teacher 3

How does Teacher 3 make sense of her work environment through the lens of affective-emotional zones?

How are the affective-emotional zones outlined by Teacher 3 characterized in terms of display rules and feeling rules?

What challenges does Teacher 3 face in particular affective-emotional zones and why?

Teacher 3 was very definitive about her affective-emotional strategies. She was eager to discuss them and had some experience doing so with social services in the UK where she had previously worked with difficult students. In some ways, Teacher 3 had a similar approach to Teacher 1 in the sense she seemed to enjoy the affective-emotional fray of the school.

Furthermore, she was not surprised by any questions I asked and could answer quickly, with some sense of enjoyment and mischief. She described herself as "confident" and "experienced". However, the corridors during break time presented a problem for her and she relinquished control to the students:

> *You put your head down and grip your coffee mug, you are just passing through, you are doing them a favour and they know it. I remember on my first teaching practice I would patrol the corridors whenever I went down there, you know, you want to show who is boss, but I never got to the staffroom cos I was always dealing with fights, or litter or swearing. It was a nightmare, you can't get through the day if you personalize every incident and the kids need the room. I gave up in the end.*

Teacher 3 spent a good deal of time in the staffroom during break and lunch. She was confident in this space:

> *When a student comes on some daft errand, I never feel like I have to put on a show, it's not like in the UK where you jump out of your chair and do the whole Sergeant Major routine, where you're like, "Wait here, young man, I'll see if they're in". The kids come in here and get photocopies or whatever and I still sit there lounging around, chatting away. Although you might watch your swearing (laughs)….It's our place. They're the guests.*

In this quote we see Teacher 3 is at ease with the feeling rule of *ownership* and displaying it to the visiting student ("I still sit there lounging around…"). In the staffroom there is no radical shift of emotional expression towards the students (other than censoring swearing) because Teacher 3 is confident that it is known as teacher territory, therefore the students have guest status within it. Teacher 3 felt very confident in the staffroom. She is very protective of students in the staffroom both formally and informally: She spoke of how surprised she could be when she found herself defending students in the staffroom or in a meeting:

> *It comes down to favouritism, I know it does, having a soft spot for a kid is very normal, particularly when you know teachers have thing against them.*

Teacher 3 uses the staffroom to defend students she knows are not always popular with staff and she felt moved to show her feelings in that space, challenging colleagues and undermining dominant narratives. What is also worth noting is her affective-emotional awareness as she identifies other teachers showing "disliking" emotions of other students as engaging in heretical acts. I have sat in many meetings with Teacher 3 and seen her defend students against teachers who have a limited ability to express positive feelings about students but are very capable of criticizing students who Teacher 3 sees as "easy to dislike." Teacher 3 was very sensitive to other teachers showing displays of 'dislike' for students; she can become irritated and she counters with clear displays of 'favouritism' to defend students.

Teacher 3's need to present students in the best light possible is demonstrated in her approach in the cafeteria and library both of which she viewed as a public space. Teacher 3 expended energy disciplining and modelling behaviour for students whom she deemed to be impolite to offset a perceived view by the cafeteria staff that the students were impolite and "spoilt":

> *I always stand there saying "please", "thank you" whenever I hear a kid not saying it. You let the kids know you are there and you have certain expectations but you are doing the kids a favour as well cos they look sheepish and say 'thanks"…basically you are saying to the cafeteria staff, "Look, our kids are not that bad".*

Teacher 3's anxiety about student conduct manifested in a behavioural ritual of modelling good manners. Teacher 3's process can be contrasted with Teacher 1's process of seeing similar negative behaviour on the part of the students outside of the office which did not result in her correcting it.

Teacher 3 related how her own daily changes in feelings would influence her affective-emotional routines particularly in the classroom: If she was in a bad mood, "taking it out on

the kids" became an affective-emotional sin and if carried out it induced feelings of "guilt" and some display rules of overcompensation, extra smiles, the use of treats (videos, food) to repay the debt of a negative emotional display. Teacher 3 acknowledged she often failed to control her "bad moods":

> *The kids are very clever. They know when you are a certain way, you hear them talking about other teachers sometimes, like "Oh I bet they didn't get any at the weekend", meaning sex, cos the teacher will have been in a bad mood or whatever, and you think, "I hope they don't talk about me that way"…You always think, well I am in a bit of a bad mood, the kids* (meaning her children) *kept me up last night, and it's not fair to take it out on some poor kid who wants to know why they got a C-.*

Teacher 3 did not use email extensively. Her emails were described as "very short " and she approached emails in a similar way to the way she approached the corridors, not wanting to involve herself in anything that might cause her extra work in a space she was not entirely confident with, similar to Teacher 2. She preferred to speak with students "face to face" to avoid lengthy interactions .

Teacher 3's affective-emotional awareness is displayed in her management of strong feelings of "hate" towards a former colleague. Teacher 3 suggested he was indicative of one of the failures of international teaching as it allowed him to keep travelling from school to school with only minimum checks on his background and should have been removed by the school sooner than he was. He posed a challenge for her as she had to work with him in various roles and she had strong reservations about his presence in the school. She wanted to maintain a professional relationship and so she had to suppress her strong feelings of "hate" and extend expressions of collegiality in meetings and in public spaces (such as the corridor and staffroom).

In sum: Teacher 3 was a very confident with her affective-emotional routines. She had very clear affective-emotional routines both in her more personal areas (such as the classroom) and in public spaces (such as the staffroom and cafeteria). She was very clear to avoid areas that

might cause her extra work (such as the corridors at break and sending lengthy emails). Teacher 3 felt anxiety in public spaces if she perceived students were not being presented in a positive light (either through their own actions or being described by other teachers) and she remedied with clear display rules that she consciously and actively regulated. A clear challenge for her was to regulate her own displays of favouritism and controlling her "bad moods" as well her feelings of "hate" towards a former colleague whom she still discussed (in negative terms) with other colleagues in the staffroom.

Teacher 4

How does Teacher 4 make sense of his work environment through the lens of affective-emotional zones?

How are the affective-emotional zones outlined by Teacher 4 characterized in terms of display rules and feeling rules?

What challenges does Teacher 4 face in particular affective-emotional zones and why?

Teacher 4's classroom was characterized by intense feeling rules of ownership and confidence ("That classroom is definitely mine, the kids know it's mine. And so does everyone else.") However, he also encouraged the students to see the space as theirs:

> *I never impose a particular seating order or plan, and it often amazes me how precisely most students feel the need to occupy the same seat in the room from one week to the next. Yet I, of course, often occupy the same space, and am quite attached to that space. And when a student is out of place, I certainly am aware of it and often comment on it, often with praise for their bold and adventurous move which of course might set back any effort to get others to be bold, who knows.*

In a similar way to Teacher 1, Teacher 4's display rules for the classroom meant seeing each class as a "performance" to be an enacted on a stage for an audience. There was a clear sense of enjoyment in his enactments as well as an admission that the "same jokes are always recycled". There were some feelings of anxiety over the long term future of maintaining what

he described as “high energy performances” and we talked about older, more experienced teachers who seemed calmer and taught classes with less performance.

Teacher 4 saw the corridors during break-time as areas where the students should be allowed to relax away from the pressures of the classroom.

> *Sometimes you hear them swear or insult each other, having a go, but unless you are right next to them, you let it go, walk on by. You can’t have the corridors as pressurized as the classroom…you are only going to attract trouble if you pick up on every infraction.*

In this example, Teacher 4 is allowing the students to break clear school rules (no swearing) because at this time of day the corridors are areas where have ownership of the space. He extended these feelings to the cafeteria which he saw as a space for the kids to “let of steam” but this produced further feeling rules of anxiety as he was not projecting a discipline routine and he wondered if the cafeteria staff would think less of him (rather than the students as Teacher 3 outlined). Interestingly, he also experienced feelings of guilt over the hierarchy of the school and the “muddle of roles” the cafeteria produced as the cafeteria staff occupied the role of *adults* in the school community but Teacher 4 did not think the students extended them the courtesy as they did other non-teaching staff. However, he also confessed to feeling “giddy” in the library because it was an “institutional space” that encouraged the opposite affective-emotional conduct for which it was intended (which Teacher 4 compared to laughing at a funeral).

Teacher 4’s emailing routines were directed by an anxiety over “offending people who read them” and altered his display rules markedly for his audience depending on their cultural backgrounds. Teacher 4 sent a great deal of emails as part of his administrative responsibilities and the number of “unpleasant experiences” was greater for him than for other teachers. Such experiences informed his approach, for example: African and East Asian parents received more formal emails compared with Northern

European and Americans. Similar to his classroom, Teacher 4 used a great deal of humour in his emails and went so far as to "use other languages" by dropping phrases he had learnt to make the reader feel more comfortable and enjoy reading his emails.

Teacher 4 took particular care to use self-deprecatory humour with "problem parents" to offset appearing too overly critical or unhappy. Whereas with parents he knew well, and had been working with for a long time he is "cheeky, informal, and personable and friendly."

Teacher 4 expressed anxiety over stories in the press that outlined teacher-student sexual relations and how they had influenced the public's perception of teaching. Consequently, for student communication, Teacher 4 was very much gender-aware in terms of himself (he would often prefix his descriptions with "As a man…") and in terms of the students ("You have to be careful with the girls…"). He imposed strict rules on himself such as not being in a room alone with female students and not interacting with them to the same extent as he described other male teachers. Here he describes his approach to emails:

> *I strive consciously for direct clear brief and kind communication. I often end with a salutation that kindly wishes them well, something encouraging and wise. But always with some effort to remember to go back and correct …to make sure there is not something that could be taken wrong.*

Teacher 4 and Teacher 5 were involved in the fuzzball league games that had been set up after a teacher had donated a fuzzball table to the school. Teacher 4 now visited the staffroom "far less" than he used to and believed it had been "relinquished" mainly to female members of staff who wanted to use the space to socialize (as he saw it). There were feelings of anger but he did not want to display these as he knew it would have professional repercussions. Teachers 4 and 5 socialized with each other in their respective classrooms (usually Teacher 4's) and often encouraging students to stay away while they drank coffee and talked during break.

In sum: Teacher 4 was guided by a sense of "audience expectations" in many areas of his work such as emailing, classrooms and corridors. He was territorially aware and relinquished control of spaces (such as the corridors, cafeteria and partly the staffroom) in affective-emotional terms (by limiting his displays) to avoid extra work. In areas where he had a clear audience he spent a great deal of effort regulating his display rules often through subtle gestures. One of Teacher 4's challenges became his "high energy" teaching performances which he knew may not always be possible over a long career. Teacher 4 was very gender-aware which caused anxiety and this influenced his interactions with students.

Teacher 5

How does Teacher 5 make sense of his work environment through the lens of affective-emotional zones?

How are the affective-emotional zones outlined by Teacher 5 characterized in terms of display rules and feeling rules?

What challenges does Teacher 5 face in particular affective-emotional zones and why?

Teacher 5 was very territorial with what he saw as he own spaces (such as his classroom and computer). He illustrated this to me by relating how he "hates it" when a substitute teacher uses the spaces and he found it difficult to suppress negative displays which he converted into positive displays:

> *I always feel like leaving them notes to tell them what to do, tell them what not to touch, you find yourself looking back when you leave, it's like giving someone your car or something, it takes an effort not to get too obsessed… you know they feel it…subs* (substitute teachers) *are really out of it, they come in they have no real connection with anyone…but I always make an effort, you know, "How are you?", "How's your day?"*

Teacher 5 outlined his resentment at territorial encroachment during his teacher training and how it affected his treatment of a perceived weaker colleague who had difficulty controlling classes:

> *His office was right next to the classroom where I taught, I even think I taught some of his classes. Anyway, when the kids got too rowdy he would just burst in and stand at the door grinning and the kids would all go quiet, then he would quietly exit.*
> *I: How does that influence you when you walk into [teacher's name] room?*
> *Good question, I kind of put my head down, you know, it's her classroom right, you can't go barging in and setting things straight, it's her room.*

Teacher 5 saw the corridors as a way to measure a school:

> *When I was a supply teacher in the UK, I knew what kind of day I was going to have by just walking in through the front door. If you had kids hanging around and generally not doing what they were supposed to be doing you knew you were going to have a busy day dealing with behaviour.*

Teacher 5 saw the corridors as a place to interact with students and in contrast to the other participants he actively sought affective-emotional interaction during break time because he felt it was rude not to:

> *I am aware that I look at everyone in the corridor, whether I know them or not, and smile and blink a hello with my eyes or articulate one out loud…The only exceptions are when I am running because I am late…Partly because I am often late.*

Engaging with students allowed Teacher 5 to feel *less anxious* in a space and time that he acknowledged was dominated by students and it served to remind him of his previous employment in "tough schools" and engage in strategies that he had used successfully in the

past. It also allowed him to display skills that he felt were looked upon favourably by management in an open way. As a consequence, and in contrast to the other participants he always stopped students he found swearing or other misbehaviour as he argued he had the skills necessary to deal with the infractions:

> *If I hear bad language, in any language I understand, I will firmly but kindly remind them others don't want to hear that. You can't just walk by, you feel bad. When students are kissing in the corridor, I look at them, smile if they make eye contact, give a little shake of the head or make a joke about keeping it out of the hallway. If a student looks miserable, I will stop and check on them, acknowledge that they look miserable, and try to offer some help or kindness but it is brief. There are simply too many kids to contend with.*

He had clear feeling and display rules particularly in the area of favouritism with certain students on the corridors. For him favouritism was a heretical feeling and emotion (in contrast to Teacher 3) that summoned memories from his own school days when a friend (male) who he described as "a lot prettier than me" had received more attention from the (female) teachers:

> *If we were getting patted on the back for something, they would still pay more attention to him than me…I was brighter and I worked harder and yet he would just grin and they would all fucking swoon.*

Teacher 5 related how the problem was particularly acute with a (female) biology teacher:

> *He fancied her and she fancied him…she was young and pretty and clearly got off on it having all these boys fancying her. I can see now how she must have had trouble dealing with it but at the time I just felt … jealous I suppose.*

Teacher 5 explained how the experience had taught him definitive display rules with students who were not always the centre of attention:

> *I mean they don't always have the social skills so you have to make conversation and make the effort…I really check myself with some kids, because they can hang around in similar couplings* (as he did), *you know, a stronger charismatic one and the weaker one, you have to focus on both of them equally, even focus on the quieter one more, to invite them in and ask questions make them part of the interaction…I over compensate and talk with kids on the corridor who don't normally get spoken to.*

Teacher 5 is using an anxiety provoking incident from his own school days to alter and moderate his own professional displays as an adult. What should be noted is his level of awareness and the impact his feelings and emotions can have on others.

Teacher 5 saw his school role through a dramaturgical lens. For example: When around the office staff he described how he affected a "little boy lost" performance to encourage the office staff to help him. And, similar to Teacher 4 there were feelings rules of "guilt" around the non-teaching staff because of the work they did and the perceived lack of pay they received. Unwanted feeling rules of 'superiority' could not be allowed to be enacted as display rules as the teacher wanted to display the notion of *dependence* on the office staff, to "keep 'em sweet", so as to lubricate an effective working relationship. The cafeteria and library (both "filled with parents") were areas he enacted his "humble academic" routine as he felt he was very much on display and reacted accordingly.

Teacher 5 had strict affective-emotional routines for emails. He talked about "leaving the door open", meaning he had been trained via his PGCE in the UK to never talk with a student with the classroom door closed, it had to be open. He engaged in student contact via email with that thought in mind coupled with the idea of parents always reading emails. This was a way of conditioning himself ("*You can't let your guard down and say something you might not say in class")* and the feeling of nervousness was used as a reminder that there are guidelines for interacting with students. Teacher 5 also used humour to offset any problems that might be encountered if the student perceives it as too formal (such as discouraging the student). And the students are seen as perceptive and aware of the rules. Teacher 5 was very articulate about

the potential for problems with teachers who cannot see the affective-emotional boundary lines:

> *Email gives you that outlet to be personal, strike an intimate tone…Teachers are human, if they are sitting there at night emailing kids some of them will need some pretty clear rules in place…making sure you know where the boundaries are…I just keep it formal and straight to the point. The kids understand it has the potential to be misused and I think they respect it more if you are very formal and succinct…Emails allow you to sit at your computer and construct a message at whatever time of your day you want…A glass of wine or two at home at 11 at night and you might start getting a bit flirty if you don't have strict rules in place… [Teachers' perception of emailing] doesn't need a recalibration.*

Teacher 5 had a stronger reaction than Teacher 4 when pressed about the removal of the fuzzball table in the staffroom. He argued it was one group of staff dominating another group. Teacher 5 acknowledged there was a lot of noise generated by the use of the fuzzball table but argued the staffroom was a space that should be used by all teachers but he "rarely went in" since the fuzzball table had been removed. He described it as a "trivial issue" and yet he spent a great deal of time complaining it had been taken away and changed his behaviour by socializing in Teacher 4's classroom.

In sum: Teacher 5 was very territorial and he had to manage negative displays towards people who occupied what he saw as his spaces. Teacher 5 managed heretical feelings of favouritism which he converted into regimental display rules (similar to Teacher 2) around students such as speaking with quieter students which he had harboured less 'favouritism' feelings for. Teacher 5 also had feelings of guilt around the lower paid staff which he would convert into deliberate displays such as "little boy lost" around the office staff and a "humble academic" routine in public spaces. Teacher 5 had to manage his negative feelings towards other members of staff in the staffroom as he suspected some of them of having the fuzzball table removed. He joined Teacher 4 in his classroom during break time as a consequence of the fuzzball table being taken

away.

Teacher 6

How does Teacher 6 make sense of her work environment through the lens of affective-emotional zones?

How are the affective-emotional zones outlined by Teacher 6 characterized in terms of display rules and feeling rules?

What challenges does Teacher 6 face in particular affective-emotional zones and why?

Teacher 6 saw her classroom in a very personal way. She argued it was a space where she could "feel alone" (which she meant in a positive way) and: "…escape some of the other possibly unpleasant thoughts or dilemmas." Consequently, Teacher 6 felt territorial encroachments very keenly. She was not happy with a glass partition that allowed noise to be carried between her classroom and the one next door as it posed challenges for her when she was trying to establish an affective tone with her classes and the students could hear a colleagues class that had a different affective tone (such as a funny story).

Teacher 6's previous school had not appointed her a classroom and she had to use a cart to transport her resources from room to room. She described her use of a cart as a "deeply sad time" and one of the reasons why she left her former school as she was not able to feel like a "proper member of staff". The corridors were described in terms of a foreign land, and she felt "lost…pushing her wares like a bag lady." It had made a deep impression on her and she told me she had asked about classroom allocation during contract negotiation at the present school. I have seen her in meetings question the principal over classroom allocation, indicating an anxiety over the space she taught in being taken away. Her previous experiences had also meant she saw the library as a personal space ("It was always quiet and you could always find a corner").

Teacher 6 had set routine of avoiding the corridors during break-time as she them student owned spaces:

> *If we can say that we have ownership over the classroom then they certainly*

have it over the corridor.

Teacher 6 also avoided the cafeteria at lunch time as it was deemed "too aggressive" and she outlined how she thought "everyone seems to be in there" including parents, staff and administrators; Teacher 6 at her lunch in her classroom as a result.

Teacher 6 had a clear sense of student owned spaces and this was reflected in her anger at other teachers who shout at the students in those spaces which she saw as a mark of disrespect. The student lounge was another area of clearly demarcated territory that resonated with Teacher 6. Teacher 6 also felt angry when she saw other teachers "walking in" to the student lounge (which is an area of corridor with a different colour carpet and two sofas) and talking to students and not acknowledging the space as student owned. Her apprehension manifested itself in displays of humility that show guest status within student owned space being reinforced and perhaps augmented by feelings of anger at the behaviour of other teachers. There is a challenge to suppress her anger towards the other teachers who are seen as code violators as Teacher 6 understands such display rules would be professionally unhelpful.

Teacher 6 saw emailing as a formal routine that she engaged in on a daily basis with students (which was not the case for all the teachers in the sample):

> *I usually approach e-mailing like a routine and make it an official part of the job. I don't have such a strict procedure when writing to parents, but when I do I tried to be objective and open for further cooperation. E-mail communication with students is on a daily basis. Those e-mails usually have very formal note.*

Teacher 6 saw the amount of emails to be written as a professional challenge to be addressed ("[It's] getting worse, the amount we do…"). Therefore, she had established methods to ensure she was able to maintain a consistent tone in her emails such as: A consistent signature line for every email; writing 'Dear…' at the heading of the email; adopting a formal writing tone; keeping emailing concise; a refusal to use emoticons and use slang. She also told me she

waits until the end of the day to reply to potentially negative emails as she be more likely to stick to her routines.

Teacher 6 also had formal routines in place for the staffroom although she did not phrase it in such terms. The following event illustrates the need to maintain a consistent atmosphere via the engineering of a consistent set of feeling rules for the space. Teacher 6 is describing when a colleague has offended another colleague:

> *But even then you wouldn't go over and discuss it. Not in the staffroom, I mean, it's not the place, it's too collegial, that sort of thing you pack away for later and go and see them privately, you know, you can't have fights and stuff in the staffroom it would be chaos. It wouldn't work…you can't get serious in there it would destroy the place.*

In sum: Teacher 6 felt territorial encroachments very keenly and had to manage feelings of anger when she felt her territory being occupied and anxiety over her classroom being taken away. Teacher 6 had to manage feelings of anger towards other staff when she saw them acting in what she thought was a disrespectful manner towards students. Teacher 6 used emailing extensively and felt anxiety over the consistency of her tone in emails which had resulted in her establishing regimented routines in all emails.

Chapter 5 – Discussion

What follows is a discussion of my findings in the context of the notions outlined in the Literature Review. I use cross-case analysis to demonstrate how teachers use feeling rules and display rules to ascribe affective-emotional meaning to situations and places. Affective-emotional zones form a heuristic for further analysis and discussion. I have divided the chapter into the following sections:

5.1 Affective-emotional zones
5.2 Affective-emotional expertise
5.3 The interplay of affective-emotional zones and physical boundaries

5.4 Affective-emotional heresy

5.1 Affective-emotional zones

I suggest there are consistencies in affective-emotional repertoires throughout the participants' responses to allow affective-emotional zones to come into existence when patterns of display and feeling rules as well as the existence of affective-emotional heresies are established. The zones are products of rituals, habits, feelings (feeling rules) and as emotional displays (display rules) and represent shared social meanings. Complete consistency would be unrealistic when dealing with feelings and emotions so I include discrepant accounts to enrich the discussion and allow the reader to see my decision making process.

Student zone

The student zone is labelled as such because there is a clear shift of ownership to the students in these areas (the corridors during break and the student lounge). The shift is partly influenced by some guilt that the "the kids don't have a lot of places to go" as the case study school did not have a great deal of outside space or internal social areas. When the students fill these geographic spaces they become student-owned partly due to sheer numbers, Teachers 2 and 4 expressed feelings of intimidation when on the corridors with students due to the size of some of the students and their boisterous behaviour, but felt they could not show such feelings and I therefore labelled them as heretical emotions. The participants tended to avoid the student zone at times when they know students are there in large numbers or shut the door of their classrooms to avoid the atmosphere or venture to spaces where they felt ownership shifted to teachers. There is a "hands-off" approach to students on corridors at certain times with a relaxation of school rules found in the classroom. The zone is characterized by feelings of anxiety and displays rules that, in most cases, limit the chances of interaction with students ("head down…grip your coffee mug"). Teacher 2 found it physically intimidating ("they loom over you"); Teacher 4 rarely ventured onto the corridors during break time while Teacher 1 adopted exaggerated routines to ignore students in what she termed "high pressure" environments. Teacher 2 clearly feels anxious on the corridors although her account is discrepant with Teacher 1 who enjoyed the fracas. Teacher 5 showed

some signs of anxiety because of the large student numbers and as a consequence of *not* interacting with students as he considered it rude whereas Teacher 4 showed less anxiety but he was very clear the corridors during break were student owned. Teacher 5 was the only participant who stopped students on the corridor he found swearing or engaging in other infractions such as kissing when he was not on duty. However, I argued he used this behaviour to feel *less anxious* and possibly to regain some sense of control in a zone that he acknowledged belonged to the students during break. Similarly, Teachers 1 and 2 had set piece emotional displays when they were on duty

The affective-emotional rules of the spaces are temporal with a sense from the teachers the students are aware of their ownership of the space at *certain times*, which was reflected in their more aggressive behaviour during break times. However, the participants intimated they retook the space during lesson time shifting the corridors to a teacher owned space with different emotional displays. For example: asking students why they are out of class with a stern manner and standing square with students they are talking to. Their assertiveness suggests that one space can have different affective-emotional rules depending on the time of day. I have seen this shift occur from one second to the next (and I myself take part in it) as the lesson times begin and teachers making their way from the staffroom suddenly become animated and start shouting: "Lesson time, get to class, why are kids on the corridor?" Rhetorical questions are part of the teacher repertoire of moving students around in large numbers, often with a sarcastic hue ("Are we thinking of going to class today?"). Teacher 1 will stand at the end of the corridor and show emotions that seconds earlier were considered heretical, for example being angry and asking students to pick up litter. It should be noted from my own observations, the students recognize and accept the shift as well, swearing and banter becomes noticeably absent as the move toward the classrooms begins. Therefore, the same geographic spaces shift ownership (and therefore zone) with different feeling and display rules at different times of the day.

An area where there was ambiguity and anxiety is the student lounge, consisting of a patch of carpet at one end of a corridor with sofas and cushions for Grade 12 students to use. The area is next to classrooms and students are allowed to socialize if they have a study period during

class time. The student lounge caused mixed feelings on the part of the participants but all had a clear notion the lounge "belonged" in its entirety to the students. All teachers adopted a 'guest status' approach when visiting the lounge, characterized by displays of humility and light-heartedness. However, there was also a consensus that other teachers were not observing the same rules and this caused some embarrassment and anger which posed a challenge for teachers to manage in front of the students. Teacher 6 felt these infractions into other spaces very keenly and was visibly angry when she described them.

Teacher zone

The teacher zone is labelled to reflect the confidence that all the participants expressed in their territorial claim to those areas within it; a zone they felt most in control of and capable of influencing the affective-emotional routines. The zone includes; the staffroom, the classroom and the corridors during class time (although not during corridor duty).

The staffroom was the one place all the participants recognized as a uniquely teacher place, often with a firm link between their feelings and emotions. It was a place for "honest collegial expression" as well a place for off-loading and having fun. It is a uniquely teacher place with strong currents of "professional respect" but with clear rules in place to maintain the atmosphere such as the regulation of wall pictures. However, the use of and then the removal of, the fuzzball table had caused consternation among some staff: Teachers 1 and 2 expressed clear dislike with the fuzzball table as it fragmented the teacher group (with games taking place in one corner of the staffroom) and its removal caused Teachers 4 and 5 to visit the staffroom far less than they used to and in some ways remade a teacher zone within their own classrooms as they visited each other regularly in these spaces; drinking coffee and talking about their personal lives. For Teachers 4 and 5 the staffroom was not part of *their* teacher zone, or at least it had less resonance for them as a teacher space but it still represented a zone owned by teachers. Teacher 6 had clear routines she used to help her socialize inside the staffroom and less sense of ownership than Teachers 1 and 2. Teacher 2 displayed particularly pronounced displays of confidence in the staffroom; "lounging around" and going against the grain and defending unpopular students both in formal and informal meetings.

The classroom was the one area that participants could all claim as their own while regularly admitting members of another community group; the students. It was the one area the participants became visibly animated when discussing. It was their "work station" and was seen as "special" and there was a degree of ease, confidence and pride when discussing the classroom. It also elicited the strongest and most uniform responses from the participants in the sense of them speaking about with confidence and at length. Teacher 6 related how in previous jobs she had not been given a classroom and had to walk the corridors between classes with boxes of resources and this caused her to deliberately ask during interview if she would be given a classroom. The classroom was linked to feeling rules of self-confidence and personal identity that led to display rules of ownership and infractions were keenly felt. There were affective-emotional discrepancies over the methods to achieve displays of ownership: Teachers 1 and 4 were typically dramatic and saw the classroom as a stage to be performed on for a discerning audience while Teachers 2 and 6 saw the classroom in much quieter terms with Teacher 2 establishing "small spaces" around the room were students worked and presumably felt some ownership over.

Teachers saw the classroom as a place of deep affective-emotional awareness and personal discipline. Temporal relativity was apparent with display and feeling rules being dependent on time with Monday mornings and Friday afternoons being frequently compared. The display rules of emotional ownership of the classroom extended to 'gifting' the space to students when it was asked thereby allowing it to become student owned for a brief time. Teachers 1, 2 and 5 would allow students to use the space at lunch and after school for socializing, rehearsing drama productions and even playing cards (in the case of Teacher 5 who allowed "rowdy boys" access to his classroom as he felt they had nowhere else to go). Gifting the space on the part of Teachers 1, 2 and 5 reinforced their territorial claim and produced gratitude on the part of the students, aiding classroom management and general relationship building. When the classroom was 'given' to the students by these teachers, different feeling and display rules come into effect such as displays of humility and feelings of relaxation. The strong sense of territory, produced confidence in the expected emotional displays, a place where teachers feel *more* in control of the display and feeling rules than in other areas of the school. In some ways, the participants were surprised I was asking about their feelings in the

classroom partly because they had never been asked and partly due to the feeling it belonged to them should be automatically acknowledged; the notion that it was their space ("it's mine!"), was a consistent theme.

Teacher 5 claimed his classroom with pictures and personal details, photographs of school trips, odd cartoons drawn by the students that had been discarded in class, hand written notes between students and even late slips decorating the edges of his board. Personalizing the space was a way to demarcate it and make it memorable, a clear link to Teacher 5's personality and an example of how he considered utilizing display rules to project his emotions in imaginative ways. Many of the displays were not curriculum orientated as he saw the space as way to create and maintain personal bonds with students outside of basic learning needs.

Communal zone

The communal zone is characterized by an awareness of the wider school community. The zone includes the toilets, the library, the cafeteria and email interaction with students.

The toilets and the library are areas where "all bets were off unless something major happened", the one area where "everyone understood those basic human rules". The toilets in the case study school were situated at the end of each corridor with the teacher's own toilets further away. None of the participants had enough anxiety *not* to use the student toilets, although all felt and displayed some. There was not a lot of data gathered around this area, questions were met with shrugs and a resistance to further probing, which I consider to be insightful but I am hesitant to outline clear analysis as a consequence. However, the toilets have been included as an area of demarcated affective-emotional activity because all the teachers felt it was a purely "human area" although only Teacher 2 used this underlying assumption to build relations. There was an overriding feeling that "everyone knows" the toilets are the one area that you are not going to push social boundaries. The display rules of being a teacher ceased in some ways, authority was put to one side and "you just get on with your business." Implicit social traits common to toilets outside of the school gave clarity and eased the underlying anxiety associated with a place that was intimate and personal, hence its

inclusion here.

The library was a place the participants were more able to discuss demarcated affective-emotional rules and routines. There was also a level of consistency the library was an area for personal and academic reflection which most people adhered to without the need for overt emotional display. Teacher 1 felt "annoyed" as libraries reminded her that books can sometimes be used as "cultural wall papering". Teacher 6 expressed a real attraction for this part of the school because it was, "serene, it's the one area that has calmness about it". Teacher 6 was more inclined to see the library through a personal lens as a consequence of spending so much time there in other schools. There was a need from the participants to perpetuate the existing atmosphere with their own behaviour and their expectations for others and there was evidence of anxiety as the library allowed parents to sit and read throughout the school day.

Within the communal zone I include the action of emailing. Teachers 4 and 5 argued emails had to potential to be misused if it was seen as a "private area" and Teacher 4 was very much aware of his own gender when he interacted with students. Emailing was seen through a wider community lens in affective-emotional terms with a great deal of anxiety on the part of the participants which fuelled formal emotional displays and caused them to reflect more acutely with regards their feelings. I initially included emailing within the scope of the teacher zone as my sample alluded to their emailing interactions when they discussed the classroom. However, in affective-emotional terms it makes more sense to place it in the communal zone as it was clearly characterized by an awareness of the wider community and anxiety associated with being on communal display. There were some discrepancies: Teacher 1 claimed she enjoyed email interaction and wrote "long and wordy" emails whereas the other participants (notably Teacher 3) tried to avoid emailing when possible, preferring face to face contact. The teachers strived to maintain a consistent tone in emails and avoided any behaviour that may have stood any chance of being negatively interpreted (there was a great deal of anxiety over this) just as they did in other public areas such as the cafeteria and library. Teacher 4 had slightly different routines dependent on the cultural group he was addressing. There is a clear desire on the part of teachers to extend their affective-emotional

control of space well beyond the school walls and have it sit in email exchanges which teachers saw as an extension of their affective-emotional repertoires they adopted in other public spaces. In contrast, the classrooms were very much seen as personal territory ("it's mine") whereas emailing was spoken of a public display terms ("you have to watch what you say."). It can be noted email interaction means affective-emotional skills become *written* and not physical or verbal as in other public areas of the school and confidence varied. Conveying feeling through writing and other expressions such as the use of emoticons (which become the emotional display) was a consideration for the participants.

In these ways, the communal zone was stripped of many of the inherent school display rules and replaced with wider behavioural expectancies governed by communal anxieties. The toilets, cafeteria and libraries were seen as embodying universal rules "the world over." An administrator has told me on school inspection visits he makes a point of visiting the student toilets as the state of repair and level of graffiti reflect how the students behave when they are away from the usual school parameters. There was a sense my participants were readying themselves for a social event when they entered these areas (the library and cafeteria allow parents to visit during the school day) and to remind themselves they have responsibilities to a community beyond the school walls characterized by extreme caution with emailing.

The communal zone presented a display and feeling rule dilemma for teachers as there was a significant role change from teacher/instructor to a community orientated role (although less so in email interaction). For example, in the cafeteria the teachers become paying customers in an environment that was usually rowdy with less direct behaviour conditioning. There was also a sense there was greater room for mischief on the part of the students and teachers partly due to the noise and general atmosphere. There was also a sense of guilt associated with being around low paid cafeteria staff ("who work incredibly hard, it reminds you what you could be doing if you weren't teaching") as well as a level of anxiety caused by a heightened level of awareness with Teacher 3 loudly reminding students to say "please and thank you". The atmosphere shift from the institutional expectancies of the corridors or staffroom to the "hustle and bustle" of a busy cafeteria or the "dead calm" of the library was disorientating for some. Some participants noted the lack of clarity over how the teachers were supposed to

behave in these areas although Teacher 2 created smaller more personal zones with students as she did in her classroom and the toilets although she did not have the same approach to the corridors.

School zone

The school zone was the area most associated with "employment and professionalism", which I interpreted as a strict adherence to what Teacher 1 described as "something all employers want, no fuss, no nonsense, just busy officiousness". I termed it the school zone as there were plenty of references to "the school" when we talked about places within this area. The notion of 'the school' can be seen as an authoritarian character that enacted change and influenced the teachers' affective-emotional routines. Often sentences would start with, "the school wants me to…" or "it's not really the schools' fault" as it had become a source of authority in their working lives.

The school zone involves a suppression of some of "that giddiness or at least that individualness you might get in your classroom". Because of the suppression of the "individualness" there was an undercurrent to anxiety and frustration which the teachers were aware of and quick to suppress. For example, Teacher 1 spoke of her "business-like" feelings of efficiency, calm- assertiveness and "positivity" and Teacher 6 said "oh God" when I spoke of the office area and then described how she spent very little time there. Teacher 5 affected a 'little boy lost' routine to offset feelings of guilt over how hard the office staff work and to encourage them to perform routine jobs. The participants universally saw themselves as being in transit in this space and did not enjoy being in here as if the inherent authority of the space watched them or at least held them accountable in the form of 'the school'.

Broadly, the participants largely felt it was owned by the other stakeholders but not the teachers. However, there were discrepancies over which group was dominant: Teacher 2 felt it was the administrator who "owned" the front of the school and felt "on display" as a result; Teacher 1 argued it was the students and described them as sitting like "John and Yoko" around the area; Teacher 5 felt it was the office staff; Teacher 6 felt it was a place teachers should not voluntarily venture into as it was too close to parents who could be seen waiting in

the office and school foyer although he did not express that view about the cafeteria or the library both places with parents present at all times of the day.

5.2 Affective-emotional expertise

Consistent affective-emotional routines were established by the participants and are an example of the expertise teachers employ to fulfil their tasks. The participants spoke about the need to have different personalities for the same class at different times of the week, semester and (according to Teacher 5) even the moon cycle. The classroom's affective-emotional rules were being *remade* for the same class or task that needed to be completed. Feeling and emotion led classroom management was the norm for the participants; they spoke of "setting the tone" and territorialising the space and having to control negative affective-emotional responses such as territorial encroachments (e.g. sub teachers and the effects of territorial partitions as well as controlling for affective-emotional heresy such as attraction, favouritism and anxiety). There was clear desire to have affective-emotional constants in space from the more experienced teachers (such as the corridors during class time, the classroom) and an acceptance space within school had clear leaders which were often time dependent (e.g. the corridors) and primary task dependent (e.g. the office).

Feeling and display rules can be seen as *repertoires* that agent-ize teachers as known and enduring within school spaces; to construct meaning and provide affective-emotional consistency. For example: Teacher 2 clearly demonstrates a fairly durable trans-situational pattern in her approach to her emails and corridors with a disciplined affective-emotional routine is deliberately enacted to reduce workload. Expertise in the affective-emotional sense becomes teachers being aware of the inherent relational characteristic of schools and asserting affective-emotional control through appropriate display rules, while attempting to control affective-emotional heresies. For example, the way the teachers dictated strict emotional terms for email interaction, or sat closer to students in the classroom when having a "quiet chat". In the case of the toilets, Teacher 2 sensed the space was open to interpretation as "all bets [were]off" and remade it by having girly chats with the students. Therefore, the teacher zone was understood by my participants to be an area over which they had greater affective-emotional responsibility and this extended into their homes and laptops if they took work

home and answered students while drinking wine or sitting in front of the television.

Approaching space through an affective-emotional paradigm and responding to challenges requires expertise and an understanding of the affective-emotional relational characteristics of the school as well as an understanding of how to enact appropriate display rules for a receptive audience. The participants were competent affective-emotional managers and were willing to discuss their own affective-emotional methods as they analysed their own feelings to produce appropriate emotions and suit the needs of the audience. Individualized governance in this way has been called *pastoral power*, (e.g. Snyder, 1974; Boler, 1999). The following factors can be said to influence affective-emotional routines:

Time-space awareness:

A consistent theme from the participants was how they used their awareness of time to plan classes and activities, recalibrate affective-emotional expectations as well control student behaviour and learning. For example: Monday mornings were used as an opportunity to give tests and quieter tasks such as revision exercises and long answer questions, whereas Friday afternoon lessons were described as having shorter tasks (to account for the perceived shorter attention span on the part of the students) and the offer of 'treats' or rewards such as watching a video and handing out chocolate. Furthermore, the corridors and classrooms were gifted to the students at certain times in the form of newly adopted affective-emotional rules such as displays of humility and wilfully ignoring misbehaviour.

Affective-emotional zones become ways in which teachers experience, understand, judge and conduct themselves within the school locale and timetable. My findings suggest affective-emotional consistency should not be seen as the regimental enactment of displays ("this is a corridor at break time so I will ignore student behaviour") as there was some flexibility. However, they do offer some predictability as teachers alter affective-emotional repertoires within the zones. For example: Teacher 1's theatrical behaviour on the corridor and Teacher 2's avoidance approach to the same space were both relatively enduring and had the same purpose of reducing anxiety. The displays were sometimes different for each teacher (Teacher 1 is not always so theatrical and Teacher 2 can be bolder and interact with students who are misbehaving

when she is not on duty) but the feeling rules were the same ("this is a space and time that may cause me difficulty") and gave them cause to consider their display rules.

Affective-emotional mechanisms:

The participants were aware of the strategies they used to attempt to regulate their feelings and emotions. Teacher 4 consciously marshalling the heretical feeling of favouritism towards a student; Teacher 1 outlined the impact food had on her own feelings as she felt her hunger was making her more anxious and irritable in the cafeteria and so she adjusted her eating habits; Teacher 5 outlined how he tried to pretend he was always "a little lost" when in the office to maintain positive relations with office staff and to allow them to feel they had control.

Regression was used to regulate feelings to produce appropriate emotions. Regression refers to instances when events at work carry with them a significant amount of anxiety leading individuals to regress to behaviours they learned earlier in their lives (Hirschhorn,1990; Kets de Vries, 1991; James and Connolly, 2000). Teachers may regress to behaviours they learnt during teacher training or even revert to feelings they experienced while students themselves. There was a form of regression in Teacher 5's description of his own experiences as a student in biology class, whereby he felt the teacher favoured his more attractive friend. When he became a teacher he found himself exhibiting similar behaviour and the incident invoked two responses; primarily it reminded him of his professional responsibilities to all students, but it also stimulated feelings of guilt as he had a clear memory of how his own teacher's favoured treatment of his friend had stayed with him. He was able to flag up the feelings of favouritism as potentially heretical and channel it to more productive emotional displays. Teacher 5 also remembered how an incident during his teacher training caused him to enter his colleagues' classrooms with humility.

Behavioural and cognitive mechanisms:

Teacher 5 deliberately saw the fax machine as a difficult machine to operate, allowing him to display helplessness and subsequently receive help from the office staff. It had become a

cognitive ritual an embedded routine instituted primarily to control work related anxiety to serve an affective-emotional purpose with positive consequences (e.g. Menzies 1975; Valsiner 2003). Some of the teachers experienced anxiety or *stage anxiety* for certain areas of the school. Clear examples of this are Teacher 1 and Teacher 2 having emotional repertoires they reverted to. Teacher 1 outlined a *performance-based* reaction to the corridors at break time with a strident walk. I have seen her walk the corridors at these times and I was not aware that her hands-behind-the-back was as consciously constructed as she intimated. I have also observed Teacher 2 at break times, she outlined how a coffee mug becomes a stage prop, something to hold to give the appearance of being "in transit" to limit the chances of being stopped and detained in an environment that she feels intimidated by. The coffee mug-as-prop coupled with the intentional 'busy' posture, are anxiety-reducing mechanisms and it is worth noting again, the students enact similar emotional performances during lesson time on the corridors when the space becomes teacher owned.

There were themes of genuineness and enjoyment within the data for affective-emotion centred tasks. The teachers enjoyed the displays they enacted. Foegen called for "hypocrisy pay" (1988) for those service agents who are expected to display and enact emotions they do not genuinely feel as part of their work expectations. However, *hypocrisy* may be seen as too strong a term, I posit the term *performance related pay* (in the stage sense) as more appropriate. This is more in line with the notion of *stage management* put forward by Hargreaves (2001) as an example of teachers responding to the expectation of anxiety by planning ahead. According to Stenross and Kleinmann (1989), acting can carry with it a degree of enjoyment, and this was largely supported by my participants with teachers becoming animated when they related how they would often "play" a situation with props, facial expressions and verbal routines. The emphasis on acting supports the dramaturgical interpretation of Hochschild's work (1983; 2003) rather than the Marxist interpretation which posits the worker as exploited (whether unconsciously or not) and alienated from the end product. The participants felt in control of their emotional displays, recognized the need to enact them and knew the costs for failure resulted in *more* work. However, there were some discrepancies with regards feelings. Some participants, most notably Teacher 2, felt confusion over feeling rules and display rules in the corridors and as a result articulated a feeling of

being “let down” by school management as there was no clear directive as to how to approach the corridors at break time. But there no sense of ‘hypocrisy’ only a degree of isolation. Teacher 2 felt she was enacting emotions without a clear mandate from the principal. As a result she felt intimidated and often avoided those areas. It should also be noted, some participants (e.g. Teachers 2 and 3) did not enjoy emailing as much as Teachers 1 and 4.

It can also be noted: Feelings of *powerlessness* were uncomfortable for my participants. The feelings were generated after they accepted they did not always have the power to shape the affective-emotional nature of the space. For example, the corridors at break time are areas of anxiety by at least two of my participants (either explicitly saying it, or outlining their routines and behaviours to deal with it) with students clearly owning the space. However, during class time the corridors were seen as being re-territorialized by the teachers; student infractions become more potent and therefore the punishments more severe, teacher’s language and displays become more confident. Teacher 5 spoke of “striding around” during class time to “catch the evil-doers”. Teacher 2 used the word “intimidation” four times during our talk about the corridors but then spoke of “enjoying the space” and “walking down the centre when they are empty”. There is a clear sense the space is there to be re-taken and through my own observations there is an acceptance of this on the part of the students, during class time they become less confident and often adopt an air of purposefulness, as if to appear on an errand (in many ways, the same reaction the teachers have during break time), loitering students during class time are stopped and questioned by members of staff.

5.3 The interplay of affective-emotional zones and physical boundaries

Seeing spaces through an affective-emotional lens was an accepted part of the teacher condition. A very strong theme in the data was a view of teaching experience being linked to understanding the display and feeling rules associated with spaces. There was also an acceptance over the relational nature of space and the need to be aware of the malleability of space and time with regards feelings and emotions. Each zone was agreed to have consistent emotional display rules with agreed time displays and therefore it was seen as a task of the teacher to understand and enact them.

The feeling rules and particularly the display rules represent agreed social constructions regarding the purpose of territory within the school providing a degree of affective-emotional consistency for the organization. The best illustration of the consistency between feelings, emotions and territory are those cases where the physical/geographical demarcation of the territory borders was not immediately obvious but still elicited strong messages towards appropriate affective-emotional conduct. For example: The student lounge had no clear demarcation and was just termed "student lounge" by the school stakeholders, students sat on couches in this area, as in other areas (such as the foyer) but teachers saw it as a stand-alone space with rules for affective-emotional conduct for themselves and the students. In this sense, within my results there was a clear influence of territory on the feelings and emotions from the participants as they all held affective-emotional expectations for the space they occupied. They spoke of various territories as "walking in there" and "when you go in", indicating an acceptance of the affective-emotional boundary lines for space with no obvious physical border. Therefore, there is an agreed affective-emotional construction by stakeholders for a space that does not exist in physical fact.

The participants' responses to the code violators can also be seen as an affective-emotional interaction with space. Code violators were those who were not seen as ignoring the existence of agreed affective-emotional zones but *acknowledging and then violating* the expected display rules, thereby augmenting the affective-emotional identity of the space. Violation elicited feelings of "anger" and "frustration" in my participants, which had to be controlled for and this influenced their own feelings and emotions in the space. Again, the uniformity in their responses suggests affective-emotional consistency and I identified it as a strong theme. Furthermore, teachers had to consciously manipulate their emotions around the (adult) code violators. For example, the presence of code violators sometimes produced exaggerated displays from my participants to compensate for the code violators' perceived transgressions, teachers who shouted in the student lounge were responded to with excessive displays of humility towards the students to reduce anxiety after the disruption.

5.4 Affective-emotional heresy

Affective-emotional heresy was a potent force of the teacher day and its existence reinforced the

feeling and display rules of the zones. For example, professional displays of fairness were influenced by feelings of favouritism and attraction, reinforcing the need for fairness in the face of inappropriate feelings. The female participants were more willing to discuss these particular heretical feelings than their male colleagues and this is supported by my experience throughout my years as a teacher – female colleagues show less restraint when discussing attraction (sometimes sexual) towards students than their male counterparts.

In some ways, the unspoken heretical feelings become vocalized to reinforce them as heretical – unspoken truths becoming spoken. I have been present in the staffroom while female colleagues discuss the perceived sexual prowess of their male students, part of an agreed heretical expression by a school sub-group that is not universally subscribed to by all members of the teaching staff, myself included. Emotional heresy in this way is acknowledged as just that - inappropriate emotion, by constant discussions and ironic comments in a staff demarcated place. I have never witnessed or heard a teacher step outside the agreed tones for these conversations; they are conducted ironically in the manner of 'naughty school girls,' sniggering over a male pin-up. At no point have I seen it elevated to adult form of equitable attraction.

Heretical feelings and emotions take skill to manage and enact appropriately (so they do not become *too* heretical). Therefore, the *primary task* in many instances becomes an attempt to control heretical feelings and emotions. Miller and Rice (1967) describe the primary task as a tool, which allows for the exploration of a multiple of activities and to construct and compare different roles. All behavioural enterprises have a primary task implicit within them, as without it, the enterprise would not survive. They can be temporarily altered but they have sufficient permanence to be identified as enduring constructs. Miller and Rice (1967) centred their focus on behaviour but my results show attempts to control feelings and emotions in spaces of the school. The heretical feelings and emotions of the participants illustrate the agreed affective-emotional rules *in contrast* in the same way affective-emotional code violators reminded teachers of the boundary lines of the spaces. In the classroom, the heretical feeling of favouritism was seen negatively, something to be cautious of and hidden or deliberately channelled to produce more productive emotions but it was universally accepted by my participants as being a natural part of teaching.

Heretical feelings are a much more normalized and potent part of the teacher condition than I could have expected. The participants were aware of them and used them to reinforce expected emotional routines such as *not* having favourites and *not* being seen to be attracted to students. The approach can be discussed further within Lawrence's (1977) differentiated view of the primary task. He described:

1. Normative Primary Task: This refers to the *formal* or *official* task of the organization and is usually defined by the chief stakeholders.
2. Existential Primary Task: Refers to the task people *believe* they are carrying out, the meaning or interpretation they place on their roles and activities.
3. Phenomenal Primary Task: Refers to *what* people are actually doing and can be inferred from people's behaviour although it is not necessarily something they will be consciously aware of.

Controlling for heretical feelings and emotions was the Normative Primary Task and it was often manifested in productive and positive displays. However, this is not always the case. For example, in the classroom, heretic feelings discussed apart from favouritism and attraction included, guilt, anger, fatigue; although two teachers argued it was okay to show tiredness in the classroom to "get the kids to calm down a bit", *tiredness* was a heretical feeling and yet became a classroom emotion for student behaviour management and therefore, projecting it became the Phenomenal Primary Task.

Often, heretical feelings and emotions were discussed in the context of the behaviour of another colleague (usually the same one) who was an agreed code violator and thought to elicit inappropriate behaviour. The heretical behaviour of another was there to remind them of the boundary rules of their own display rules and reinforce the heretical feelings and emotions as being heretical. I knew the colleague they would use for this purpose and his behaviour at the school could be unorthodox (such as spending lunch with students in his room) and he showed little interest in establishing a positive reputation for himself but there was never any evidence he had done anything illegal or immoral. There was also no evidence he had married

a former student since leaving the school and yet this was a persistent rumour and seemed to be believed by a majority of my participants. He had become more of a character in the on-going narrative of the school with different sub-groups holding different attitudes towards him. To some students he had been seen as rebellious whereas some teachers were very negative or indifferent as he avoided socializing in the staffroom. However, two of my participants (Teacher 2 and Teacher 6) whispered when they spoke of him, leaning forward and constantly peppering their responses with sexual phrases and exaggerated allegations.

Chapter 6 - Conclusion

The conclusion chapter is divided:

6.1 Findings
6.2 Implications
6.3 Future research
6.4 Reflexive Remarks

6.1. Findings

With this Research Enquiry I argued consideration for feelings, emotions and affective-emotional zones are fundamental in the on-going construction of the school as a workplace for adults. There were two stages to the analysis: To characterize the affective-emotional nature of geographical areas and to characterize and identify challenges within affective-emotional zones. I argued affective-emotional zones come into existence when patterns of display and feeling rules as well as the existence of affective-emotional heresies are established from the users of the space. My findings can be summarized as follows:

i. Schools can be investigated through affective-emotional zones.

Affective-emotional zones are products of shared teacher rituals, habits, feelings (feeling rules) and emotions (display rules). The zones represent a form of affective-emotional signification, a reaction to and a representation for, interaction in the school. I do not

hypothesize the zones as definitive monolithic places. I tried to collect a broad picture of the participants' affective-emotional descriptions and I was able to label and describe four zones.

The Communal Zone

The communal zone was labelled as such because the participants universally outlined clear areas of the school where there was a sense of *community*. There was a sense that the school as an institution was a *play* in the dramatic sense, and the participants had a certain set of affective-emotional rules to guide their performance for an audience that included students but also large numbers of other community stakeholders. The zone includes; the toilets, the library, cafeteria and email interaction. The communal zone was stripped of many of the inherent school display rules and replaced with wider behavioural expectancies driven by anxiety. There was a sense my participants were readying themselves more pointedly in the zone as they reminded themselves they had responsibilities to a community beyond the school walls.

The School Zone

The school zone was the area most associated with 'professionalism'. I termed it the school zone as there were plenty of references to 'the school' when we talked about places within this area. The notion of 'the school' was seen as an authoritarian character that influenced the teachers' affective-emotional routines. In this way, it became similar to the principal as a power source in their working lives. The school zone is an area at the front of the school both literally and figuratively. The teachers saw themselves as being in transit in the space and did not enjoy being there as if the inherent authority of the space held them accountable. The participants articulated how it was defined in affective-emotional terms by the *other* stakeholders (such as students and office staff) although there was no agreement on which group was dominant. Some of the participants felt it had universal display rules to other schools they had been in. The foyer was the main geographical centre point and there was, again, a sense it represented a theatre stage, with clear roles for performers and an audience.

The Student Zone

The student zone was labelled as such because there was a clear shift of ownership to the

students in these areas. When the students fill these geographic spaces they become student-owned and some teachers tended to avoid the student zone. The zone was partly characterized by anxiety arising from uncertainty over the exact role teachers should adopt in the student zone. The affective-emotional rules of the student zone were more time sensitive than other areas with the territory having to be 'retaken' (in affective-emotional terms) at appointed times during the day. The start of lessons signalled a new set of affective-emotional rules diametrically opposite to the rules felt and displayed just seconds before with teachers showing and feeling 'authority' and encouraging students to leave the areas and go to class. Therefore, certain areas in the student zone (most notably the corridors) were able to shift zones as the affective-emotional routines changed in response to time changes.

The Teacher Zone

The teacher zone was labelled to reflect the confidence that all the teachers expressed in their territorial claim to the spaces within it. The zone includes; the staffroom, the classroom and the corridors (during class time). The teacher zone has high levels of affective-emotional awareness for the teachers. For example, the display rules of emotional ownership of the classroom extended to 'gifting' the space to students when it was asked – thereby allowing it to become student owned for a brief time with an accompanying shift in feeling and display rules. The teacher zone is a place of lower anxiety when compared to other zones as affective-emotional routines are clearer, more rehearsed and have greater predictability.

ii. Heretical feelings and emotions constitute elements of the teacher condition.

There was an awareness of the corrosive nature of inappropriate feelings and emotions (such as favouritism and attraction) which resulted in closer affective-emotional management. For example, professional displays of fairness were often rooted in feelings of favouritism and attraction, reinforcing the need for an emotional display of fairness in the face of inappropriate feelings. Code violators were clearly identified and served as reminders for affective-emotional conduct *in contrast*. In sum: The participants understand the nature of heretical feelings and emotions and had the affective-emotional skills to manage and ultimately channel them to productive ends.

iii. Digital classrooms are defined through affective-emotional boundaries.

New technology poses affective-emotional challenges for teachers as it has the potential to blur the affective-emotional boundaries of the school. The sample saw emailing through a wider community lens that led to an increase in anxiety over their actions. It was noted new domains (such as Facebook) could have a greater degree of intimacy than email and these areas represent new affective-emotional spaces for teachers as they have the potential to shift from the community zone to a teacher zone. New technology carries the potential to blur affective-emotional boundaries between personal, community and professional spaces. My participants were able to articulate the affective-emotional practices they used to construct and regulate spaces and maintain appropriate affective-emotional identities within it.

iv. School affective-emotional zones are temporal and require affective-emotional labour to be recognized and enacted.

School spaces shift from one affective-emotional zone to another as a consequence of time changes. For example, the corridors became part of the student zone during break and lunch periods and the teachers enacted appropriate affective-emotional routines to acknowledge the shift. However, the corridors were 'retaken' during lesson time and brought into the teacher zone with teachers adopting distinctive affective-emotional rituals that help transition the area to a new affective-emotional zone. It should be noted there was not a universal adherence to the affective-emotional rules with the less experienced of the participants feeling confusion about exactly how they were supposed to interact with students in these areas at certain times.

6.2 Implications

Introduction

Data collection in a case study includes; observations, interviews, as well as *impression* and *intuition* (Wellington, 2000). The following section while grounded in data, are implications based on my impressions, experiences and intuition as a result of working on the enquiry, sorting my data and spending time with my participants. I undertook an ethical and modest

approach to data interpretation, based partly on Strauss and Corbin (1998) who argued descriptions must be the result of appearing frequently and interpretations must be logical and consistent.

An awareness of the affective-emotional relational nature of space

Conceptualising the school through affective-emotional zones was the focus of my work and I found affective-emotional based representations beyond the territorial borders of the institution which has important implications as schools move towards technology based systems for curriculum delivery and communication. Institutions can be viewed in terms of their affective-emotional consistency and their ability to create and regulate appropriate affective-emotional zones.

School space has traditionally had a public dimension (classrooms, corridors, assembly halls) but increasingly, spaces associated with school are becoming more relational and potentially more private with less monitoring by other stakeholders being the potential consequence. In affective-emotional terms, the new digital spaces have the potential to produce a school and possibly teacher free zone, drained of the affective-emotional reminders and routines that demarcate the non-digital life of the users and allow more personalized zones to be enacted. The findings suggest experienced teachers will be able to recognize the affective-emotional nature of the spaces and regulate their feelings and emotions appropriately. However, administrators need to make provision for the affective-emotional challenges stakeholders will face as digitalization of the school landscape progresses as well as understand the new conceptualizations of space inside their institutions.

The affective-emotional demands of the zones represent challenges for teachers who often respond by remaking space through affective-emotional leadership. The classroom and corridors are the best examples of this; teachers were time-aware and responded in different ways at different times during the school day. Therefore, authority and experience can be characterized in terms of the teachers' awareness of the affective-emotional potential of their actions within space and asserting control over them when appropriate via displays and controlling for heretical feelings and emotions. The *primary task* in many instances becomes

the control of heretical feelings and enacting appropriate emotions. However, it should be noted, not all of my participants were so confident in all areas of the school.

Teacher training

The study reinforced the notion teaching is not just about content delivery but it is also about building and maintaining relationships with young people. Therefore, active awareness of and developing skills with feelings and emotions is a key characteristic of the teacher condition. The participants took pride in their abilities to create and sustain affective-emotional environments around the school. Based on my findings I am suggesting the following points have implications for teacher training:

- Affective-emotional routines lend weight to the notion of a 'teacher-personality'. The participants spoke about their "teacher voice" and "that's just me being a teacher." Teaching *as an act* (in the stage sense with the affective-emotional constituent parts of stage performers) was an accepted part of the participants' routines and could be discussed with teacher trainees.
- Heretical feelings such as favouritism and attraction, guilt and anger were an accepted part of dealing with young people. Some of the participants were able to talk more freely than others (and the gender divide has been noted). The participants understood the corrosive nature of these feelings and emotions and used them to create healthy relationships and display appropriate emotions.
- Teachers are articulate and astute when discussing their skills with feelings and emotions. Having group discussions between experienced teachers and teacher training candidates over their affective-emotional rules would enhance understanding.
- The extension of teaching and learning into digital domains represents new frontiers for teaching as an affective-emotional act. New technology has the potential to blur the affective-emotional boundary lines of professional, community and personal spaces. Teacher training should play a part in making teachers aware of the affective-emotional challenges they will face and establishing universal codes of conduct and good practice for teachers.

Administrative

The classroom in particular was seen clearly in affective-emotional terms and teachers felt infractions keenly in this area either from students or management such as being moved at short notice or in some cases not having a classroom at all. The participants saw the classroom in affective-emotional terms and used it to create bonds with students above and beyond curriculum needs. The participants were annoyed when other colleagues were allowed to behave outside of the implicit affective-emotional boundaries as they deemed it unprofessional. They also outlined how the new technology was not understood enough by some teachers and it being left to individuals to create rules and guidelines over how to interact with students digitally, when it was the role of management to either set the tone and demarcate the affective-emotional expectations or at least initiate discussion of it. Administrators need to be aware of the affective-emotional nature of the school and ask questions over what is trying to be accomplished (in affective-emotional terms) within the spaces and how it impacts teacher and student behaviour.

Architectural

Some areas within the case study school lacked physical presence. For example, the student lounge had different coloured carpet that was easily missed and the teachers remarked on how it posed challenges for some colleagues who were less aware of the affective-emotional nature of the space. All the teachers felt a strong affiliation with the classroom and staffroom and yet some outlined how in some schools they had worked for, both these spaces seemed to be afterthoughts both in architecture with staffrooms being too far away for practical use and/or being too small; classrooms having poor noise insulation and glass partitions which my High School participants universally hated and school timetable planning with teachers being asked to share rooms when there was no need to. Student common areas were seen as essential and yet at my case study school (less than ten years old and designed specifically as a school) there was an absence of architectural provision for them and it was a constant refrain from the student council to have more space for student use.

6.3. Future Research

Below are potential future questions:

- What are the characteristics of affective-emotional zones for other stake holders – students, parents, support staff and what are the challenges they face within them?
- To what extent is digital technology changing the affective-emotional landscape of the school?
- What are the affective-emotional challenges students/parents/teachers face with the digitalization of the school landscape?
- How do schools construct and regulate appropriate affective-emotional interaction inside their digital domains?
- How do teachers construct and regulate appropriate affective-emotional interaction inside their digital domains?
- How are teacher-personal spaces defined within school digital landscapes? To what extent should students be allowed to access teacher-personal spaces within school digital landscapes?
- To what extent does the blurring of personal and professional spaces in schools pose a challenge to effective teaching and learning?
- To what extent are teacher's affective-emotional relationships with space a factor in effective student learning?
- To what extent are teacher's affective-emotional relationships with students a factor in effective student learning?

6.4 Reflexive Remarks

Criticisms and Strengths

The Research Enquiry was too ambitious in scope. There were three research questions:

> *How do participants in a school make sense of their work environment through the lens of affective-emotional zones?*
>
> *How are affective-emotional zones characterized in terms of display rules and feeling rules?*
>
> *What challenges do teachers face when they are in particular affective-emotional zones and why?*

With hindsight, I would have preferred:

How do participants in a school make sense of their work environment through the lens of affective-emotional zones?

I then could have used Hochschild's notions of display and feeling rules to characterize the zones. Moreover, the notion of *challenges* added nuance to the data set and discussion but ultimately constrained me as I had to cover a significant amount of challenges from the participants in addition to their display and feeling rule characterisations. Therefore, I would have removed the *challenges* question.

Furthermore, it would have been more realistic to devote 40, 000 words to one affective-emotional zone, one teacher-role (e.g. corridor duty, class room teaching, parents evening), one affective-emotional heresy such as attraction or one space such as the staffroom, teacher's classroom or corridor. The corridors are an interesting because they caused such exaggerated behaviours and/or anxiety. Investigating affective-emotional descriptions of the corridors would have been enough for the word limit and I regret not pursuing a more realistic research avenue both from a methodological and a word count perspective. A further preference would have been to configure affective-emotional repertoires as they jostled with times (the corridors at break time versus class time), other spaces (how teachers feel when they step from their classroom to the corridors) or teacher roles (how teacher duties impact affective-emotional repertoires in spaces around the school). The zones became unwieldy as a research concept for the word count and I felt pressure to cover all of the school spaces, relative to various times and teacher roles while addressing the research questions in the context of each individual participant. However the reader can note I would not have arrived at these views unless I had conducted the enquiry.

Teachers 1 and 2 presented me with radically different personalities which influenced how they felt and behaved in spaces. Teacher 1 was dramatic and saw her room through a stage lens while Teacher 2 talked about "small spaces" around the room were students worked and presumably felt greater ownership over. An avenue of future investigation would be to interview students they had in common: I have visited both classrooms during teaching time and the contrast is significant with Teacher 1 taking centre stage and performing while Teacher 2 often chooses to work with small groups on the floor seated on cushions. I wonder

about the implications for learning and how students feel in these areas. I also wonder how these teaching personalities would be transferred onto a digital landscape and what other teachers could learn as a result.

The zones are asymmetric in terms of data support. I accept this as part of the research process but the school and community zones have less structural confidence than the student and teacher zones. However, my discussions around the affective-emotional life of teachers produced rich data overall. I experienced reticence when the teachers discussed their feelings of favouritism and attraction. I did not want the enquiry to be defined by what is potentially a controversial subject. I outlined them in broad terms as affective-emotional heresies but there is perhaps, a lack of depth in those areas. Two female participants (one in particular) seemed to enjoy relaying their feelings of sexual attraction towards male students but the jokes and stories did not chime with the other participants (nor did I always pursue them with some participants) so I was reluctant to make too much of them. I include them because I have encountered sexual banter concerning students amongst colleagues before (it should be noted I have never contributed as I consider it unbecoming) and I suggest they are an area for future researchers to uncover.

The results reflect my broad interest in schools as affective-emotional places but if I had increased the number of participants while centring my questions on a smaller geographic or affective-emotional area the data would be richer, with more focus. An improvement on my questions would be: What are the affective-emotional characteristics of teacher spaces inside schools? With this question I could clearly demarcate teacher spaces (such as classrooms and the corridors at certain times) and then explore them in depth. The affective-emotional characteristics of emailing became particularly interesting to me as the enquiry progressed and I have argued digital domains are a focus for future enquiry.

My participants were experienced teachers and the formal line they all adopted with emails suggests a rather old-fashioned approach to my mind. Communication within and without of schools has moved very quickly since I undertook the enquiry and digital interaction with students now includes video and photograph postings in often obscure digital spaces (both

inside and outside of school digital territory) particularly with less experienced and usually younger teachers. Therefore, while I originally wanted participants who were experienced in traditional school spaces (the classroom and corridors and so on) I should have sought a broader sample (with less experienced as well as teachers with greater technology usage) and then compared the accounts. However, it should be noted, the school where I conducted the research had limited digital infrastructure at the time of collecting data so the results may have been limited; a future study might include revisiting the school after extensive digitalization and then comparing the affective-emotional characteristics of the spaces. I also chose teachers who I knew to be enthusiastic and 'career minded.' If I was to repeat the study I would include teachers who enjoyed less positive reputations in terms of their teaching skills or social identities. Many of the richer discussions came from participants who were unhappy in certain areas or about other teachers who were seen as rebellious and pushed boundaries.

For all of my participants I was in no way "a man without a history" (Schulz, 1971: 34). I assume I have a reputation for being a competent teacher with a credible professional and social standing with my colleagues. I had occupied a lower ranking administrative pastoral role at the school and had therefore spoken publicly about various issues important to me. The participants may well have been less willing to present themselves in a negative light for fear of being judged (Shah, 2004). I do not hold the view that researchers who are *known* automatically contaminate their data. However, I accept the area is not without considerable debate and Teacher 2 may have withheld information she felt reflected negatively on her although she was able to critically reflect on her behaviour more than Teacher 6. I had a social relationship with Teacher 2 which may have moderated any reticence on her part – the interview was jovial and in keeping with our social relationship. In general, I would argue for Teachers 2, 4 and 5 my social relationship benefited the data gathering significantly.

The small sample size allowed personal voices to enrich the enquiry and my approach to the interviews as well as my interest in teacher stories are strengths of the study as my results are coloured with teacher-speak; thick and accented, colloquial and ironic and go some way to reflect my experiences as an international teacher. Word count considerations resulted in these being heavily edited but I was determined the report should include a 'primal telling'. My

finding that teachers should be given more opportunity to discuss their affective-emotional worlds is reflected in the participants' enthusiasm for the project and the stories they recounted.

My use of the active interview technique allowed a dynamic approach to data gathering and took me beyond formal interviews which I feel could have constrained the participants. However, I could have made use of photographs and asked teachers to record their own affective-emotional zones with a camera. Furthermore, I could have performed observations whereby I collected data by watching teachers go about their business or reading emails. If I was to run this study again, I would spend more time observing teachers in their classrooms, assemblies, staffrooms and so on, recording their facial tics, hand gestures, voice tone changes and the use of eye contact and the other behavioural routines and then use this data to inform the interviews.

My participants were western-centric (US/UK and Canadian with English as their first language), which can be seen as a criticism. However, the sample goes some way to reflect the makeup of many schools on the international scene. For greater diversity an appropriate way forward would have been to seek student voices as well as non-teaching staff and then triangulate reflections. Student cohorts tend to be more diverse in international schools than teacher groups and future research may chart the affective-emotional contours of the student day and investigate the challenges students face from different cultural backgrounds. I chose not to comment on the relationship between culture and affective-emotional zones as I did not explicitly pursue it in my research questions as I deemed it too broad. Cultural diversity would have enriched the data and I acknowledge the lack of comment may seem odd to any reader new to the international teaching scene. I suggest this would be an interesting area to pursue for academics interested in international schools as it would open up debate between culture and affective-emotional zones.

A note on my view of facts

My stated view of facts is that they serve as non-linguistic correlates of true statements, a view that falls broadly within compositional approach to facts. That is, a fact is regarded as

something formed by putting components together to form a whole (Newman, 2002). Alternatively, I could have used a *linguistic* approach to facts. The linguistic approach starts with linguistic expressions and singles out some of these on account of their linguistic form as describing states of affairs, states of affairs being introduced merely as what those expressions describe. For the linguistic approach, facts are not units of any sort and speaking about facts is merely a general way of speaking of how things are in the world (Newman, 2002). Furthermore, the structure of facts can be regarded as something that can only be shown and not spoken of directly (Wittgenstein, 1971). However, such a position would have been at odds with Hochschild's notions. She argues social situations cause feelings and emotions to become *objects of awareness* but she also insists people can describe how they think, feel and use emotions. Consequently, I chose a broadly compositional view of facts, wholes that can be commented on said to correspond to statements made about them.

I recognize differentiating facts via a compositional and linguistic approach would prompt further discussion as to the nature of the connection that exists among the components of a fact and why they form the fact rather than another fact with the same components. Such a discussion would be worthwhile given the varied descriptions of affective-emotional components that have comprised participant responses and the implications for the holistic propositions I present as affective-emotional zones. However, I chose to pursue a compositional approach as I was interested in the affective-emotional building blocks of affective-emotional zones (that is, display, feeling and heretical rules) and wanted to limit extended analysis of linguistic constructions as discussions can become layered with unnecessary ambiguity leading to an inhibition of new ideas (Andreski, 1972 cited in Sokal and Bricmont, 1999). Furthermore, Wittgenstein's view emphasizes the way in which the components *hang together* which again would hold potential for future discussion over the nature of affective-emotional zones. I recognize the enquiry may have been richer in a traditional qualitative sense had I pursued a linguistic approach to fact building. Overall, the potential for facts to be irreducible entities in their own right or comprised of structured components (and the extents therein) holds ramifications for ontological premises over the use of feelings and emotions in research and the extent to which they can used to claim correspondence to truth.

References

Allen, J. and Cohen, J. (2006), Emotional intelligence in classrooms and in schools: what we see in the educational setting, in K. Murphy, (2006), *A Critique of Emotional Intelligence: What are the problems and how can they be fixed?* New Jersey, Erlbaum.

Altman, I., and Low, S. (Eds), (1992), *Place Attachment: Human Behavior and Environment*, New York: Plenum Press.

Amin, A. (2002), Spatialities of globalization, *Environment and planning A*, 34: 385- 399 in Murdoch, J. (2006), *Post-structuralist geography: A guide to relational space*, London, Sage.

Amsterdam, A. G., and Bruner, J. S., (2000), Minding the law, cited in Webster, L. and Mertova, P. (2007), *Using Narrative Inquiry as a Research Method*, London, Routledge.

Anderson, G. L. and Jones, F. (2000), Knowledge generation in educational administration from the inside out: the promise and perils of site-based, administrator research, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(3), 428–464 cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Andreski, S. (1972), Social sciences as sorcery in Sokal, A. and Bricmont, J. (1999), *Intellectual Impostures*, London, Profile Books.

Arendt, H. (1958), *The Human Condition*, Chicago, Chicago University Press.

Armstrong, D. (2007), Emotions in organizations: disturbance or intelligence in: C. Huffington, D. Armstrong, W. Halton, L. Hoyle, J. Pooley, (eds.), *Working Below The Surface: The Emotional Life of Contemporary Organizations*, London, Karnac.

Ashforth, B.E. (1989), Of canned laughter and political handlers: the erosion of spontaneity and authenticity in social life, *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association*, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Ashforth, B. E. and Humphrey, R.H. (1993), Emotional labor in service roles: the influences of identity, *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 18 (1) 88-115.

Ashforth, B. E. and Mael, F. (1989), Social identity theory and the organization, *Academy of Management Review*, 14: 20-39.

Barnes, T. and Duncan, J. (1991), Writing worlds: Discourse, text, metaphor in the representation of landscape, London, Routledge in Murdoch, J. (2006), *Post-structuralist geography: A guide to relational space*, London, Sage.

Barnett, R. (2003), *Beyond all reason: Living with ideology in the university*, in Costley, C.,

Elliot, G. and Gibbs, P. (2010), *Doing work based research: approaches to enquiry for insider-researchers*, London, Sage.

Bartky, S. (1990), *Femininity and Domination: Studies in the Phenomenology of Oppression*, New York, Routledge.

Bauman, Z. (1991), *Modernity and Ambivalence*, Cambridge, Polity Press.

Baumeister, R.F. (1982), A Self-preservational view of social phenomena, *Psychological Bulletin*, 91, 3-26.

Baumeister, R. F., Bratislavsky, E., Muraven, M., and Tice, D. M., (1998), Ego Depletion: Is the active self a limited resource? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1252-1265.

Bell, D. (1973), The coming of the post-industrial society in Hochschild, A.R. (1983), *The Managed Heart: the commercialization of human feeling.* Berkeley, C.A, University of California Press.

Berger, P. and Luckman, T (1966), *The Social Construction Of Reality: A Treatise in the sociology of knowledge,* New York, Doubleday and Co.

Bion, W. R. (1961), *Experiences in Groups and Other Papers,* London, Tavistock Publications.

Blackburn, R. (1965), Emotionality, repression-sensitization, and maladjustment, *British Journal of Psychiatry, 111,* 399-400.

Blase, J. and Anderson, G. (1995), *The Micropolitics of Educational Leadership*, New York, Teachers College Press.

Blau, P. (1964), *Exchange and Power in Social Life*, New York, Wiley.

Bogdan, R. and Biklen, S. (1982), *Qualitative Research for Education*, Boston, Allyn and Bacon.

Boler, M. (1997), Disciplined emotions: Philosophies of educated feelings, *Educational Theory, ProQuest Education Journals*, 47, 2.

Boler, M. (1999), *Feeling Power: Emotions and Education*, London, Routledge.

Bollnow, O. F. (1994), The objectivity of the humanities and the essence of truth, *Philosophy today*, Vol. 18, 1/4, pp. 3-18.

Bower, G. H. (1981), Mood and memory, *American Psychologist*, 36, 129-148.

Boys, J. (2008), Between unsafe spaces and the comfort zone? Exploring the impact of learning environments on 'doing learning' paper presented at *e-Learning and Learning Environments for the future,* Solstice 2008, 5th June, Edge Hill University UK in Boys, J. (2011), *Towards creative learning spaces: rethinking the architecture of post-compulsory education*, London, Routledge.

Boys, J. (2011), *Towards creative learning spaces: rethinking the architecture of post-compulsory education*, London, Routledge.

Bradley, R. and Swartz, N. (1979), Possible worlds: An introduction to logic and its philosophy, in Newman, A. (2002), *The correspondence theory of truth: An essay on the metaphysics of predication,* Cambridge University Press, New York.

Brotheridge, C. and Lee, R. (1998), On the dimensionality of emotional labor: Development and validation of an emotional labor scale in Grandey, A. (2000). Emotion regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology,* 5(1), 95–110.

Bruner, J. (1986), *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds,* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bulmer, M. (1982), When is disguise justified? Alternatives to covert participant observation, *Qualitative Sociology*, 5 (Summer), 269–285, cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Campbell, A. (2002), Implementing appraisal: a case study of the implementation of an appraisal system. Unpublished Ed.D. thesis, *The Open University* cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Carter, K. (1993), The place of story in the study of teaching and teacher education, *Educational Researcher,* 22, 5-12.

Carter, J. (2004), Research notes: reflections on interviewing across the ethnic divide, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology,* 7(4), 345–353 cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Carter, K., and Doyle, W. (1987). Teachers' knowledge structures and comprehension processes, in J. Calderhead (Ed.), *Exploring Teachers' Thinking,* London: Cassell.

Cartwright, R. (1987), Propositions, in Newman, A. (2002), *The correspondence theory of truth: An essay on the metaphysics of predication*, Cambridge University Press, New York.

Chambliss, D. F. (1996), *Beyond Caring: Hospitals, Nurses and the Social Organization of*

Ethics, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Cheney, G. (1983), On the various changing meanings of organizational membership: A field study or organizational identification, *Communication Monographs*, 50, 342-362.

Cherry, E. (1953), Some experiments on the recognition of speech, with one and with two ears, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 25, 975-979 in Michaels, C. and Carello, C. (1979), *Direct perception*, New Jersey, Prentice Hall.

Chodorow, N. (1999), The Power of Feelings: Personal Meaning in Psychoanalysis, Gender, and Culture, MA, Yale University Press, cited in Hochschild, A. (2003), *The Commercialization of Intimate Life: Notes from Home and Work*, LA. University of California Press.

Conradson, D. (2005), Freedom, space and perspective: moving encounters with other ecologies, in J. Davidson, L. Bondi and M. Smith, (Eds.), *Emotional Geographies*, Hampshire, UK, Ashgate.

Costley, C., Elliot, G. and Gibbs, P. (2010), *Doing work based research: approaches to enquiry for insider-researchers*, London, Sage.

Crang, M. and Thrift, N. (2000), Introduction, in M. Crang and N. Thrift (eds), *Thinking Space*, London, Routledge, in Murdoch, J. (2006), *Post-structuralist geography: A guide to relational space*, London, Sage.

Crawford, M. (2009), *Getting to the Heart of Leadership: Emotion and Educational Leadership*, London, Sage.

Cresswell, J. W. (1996), Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five traditions California, Sage cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Dahlberg, G. Moss, P and Pence, A. (1999), *Beyond Quality in Early Childhood Education and Care: Postmodern Perspectives*, London, RoutledgeFalmer.

Davidson, D. (1996), The folly of trying to define truth, *Journal of Philosophy*, 93, 263-278 in Newman, A. (2002), *The correspondence theory of truth: An essay on the metaphysics of predication*, New York, Cambridge University Press.

Damasio, A. (2000), *The Feeling of What Happens: Body, Emotion and the Making of Consciousness*, London, Heinemann.

Dean, M. (1994), "A social structure of many souls": Moral regulation, government and self formation in Rose, N. (1998), *Inventing ourselves: psychology, power and personhood*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

De Certeau, M. (1987), Practices in space in Blonsky, M. (ed.), On signs, in Thrift, N. (2008), *Non-representational theory: space, politics, affect*, London, Routledge.

Denzin, N. K., and Lincoln, Y. S. (1998), Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and* issues (pp. 1–34), Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

De Sousa, R. (1987), *The rationality of emotion*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Deutsch, C. P. (1981) The behavioral scientist: insider and outsider, *Journal of Social Issues*, 37(2), 172–191 cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Design Council, (2005b), *Design Matters in Cheshire*, Cheshire County Council Building Development.

Drake, P. (2010), Grasping at methodological understanding: a cautionary tale from insider research *International Journal of Research and Method in Education*, 33: 1, 85 — 99.

Drake, P. (2011), *Practitioner research at doctoral level: Developing coherent research methodologies*, Oxon, Routledge.

Dreyfus, H. and Rabinow, P. (1983), *Michael Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press in Lather, P. (1991), *Getting Smart: Feminist Research and Pedagogy with/in the Postmodern*, New York, Routledge.

Dyck, J. A., (1994), The case for the L-shaped classroom: Does the shape of a classroom affect the quality of the learning that goes inside it? cited in McGregor, J. (2007), Understanding and managing classroom space, *Curriculum Briefing*, Vol. 5 No. 2.

Eagleton, T. (1996), *The Illusions of Postmodernism*, Oxford, Blackwell.

Edwards, A. D. and Furlong, V. J. (1985), Ethnography and theory construction in educational research, in: R. Burgess (Ed.) *Field methods in the study of education*, Lewes, Falmer Press, cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Ekman, P. and Friesen, W. V. (1975), *Unmasking the face: A guide to Recognizing emotions from facial clues*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Elbaz, F. (1991). Research on teachers' knowledge: The evolution of a discourse, *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 23,* 1-19.

Englebretsen, G. (2006), *Bare facts and naked truths: A correspondence theory of truth*, Aldershot, UK, Ashgate.

Epstein, J.L. (1998), *Parent Involvement*, Baltimore, John Hopkins Unveristy, Centre for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools.

Fay, J. (2000), A narrative approach to critical and sub-critical incident briefings cited in Webster, L. and Mertova, P. (2007), *Using Narrative Inquiry as a Research Method*, London, Routledge.

Fanselow, J. (1977), Beyond Rashomon: conceptualizing and describing the teaching act, *Tesol Quarterly*, Vol: 11, 1, 17 – 39.

Fineman, S. (1993), Organizations as emotional arenas in: S. Fineman (ed.) *Emotions in organizations* (pp. 101-115). London, Sage.

Fineman, S. (2004), Getting the measure of emotion - and the cautionary tale of emotional intelligence, *Human Relations*; 57; 719 – 740.

Fineman, S. (2008), *The emotional organization, passions and power*, Oxford, Blackwell.

Fisher, K. (2000), Schooling issues digest: Building better outcomes the impact of school infrastructure on student outcomes and behaviour, cited in McGregor, J. (2003), Making spaces: teacher workplace topologies, *Pedagogy, Culture and Society,* Volume 11 (3).

Fitch, H. and Turvey, M. (1978), On the control of activity: some remarks from an ecological point of view, in B. Landers and R. Christina (Eds.), *Psychology of Motor Behaviour*, Urbana, 111: Human Kinetics in Michaels, C. and Carello, C. (1979), *Direct perception*, New Jersey, Prentice Hall.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2001), *Making social science matter: why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, in Drake, P. (2011), *Practitioner research at doctoral level: Developing coherent research methodologies*, Oxon, Routledge.

Foegen, J.H. (1988), Hypocrisy pay, *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 1, 85-87.

Forgas, J. P. (1992), Affect in social judgements and decisions: a multi process model in M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental and Social Psychology*, 25, 227-275, San Diego, Academic Press.

Fortier, A. (2005), Pride politics and multiculturalist citizenship, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(3), 559–578.

Foucault, M. (1986a), On the genealogy of ethics: an overview of work in progress in Rose, N. (1998), *Inventing ourselves: psychology, power and personhood*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Foucault, M. (1986b), The history of sexuality, vol 3: the care of the self in Rose, N. (1998), *Inventing our selves: psychology, power and personhood*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Frege, G. (1892a), On concept and object, in Geach and Black (eds), (1970), in Englebretsen, G. (2006), *Bare facts and naked truths: A correspondence theory of truth*, Aldershot, UK, Ashgate.

Frege, G. (1967), The thought: A logical inquiry in P.F. Strawson (ed), *Philosophical Logic*, Oxford, Oxford University Press in Englebretsen, G. (2006), *Bare facts and naked truths: A correspondence theory of truth*, Aldershot, UK, Ashgate.

Freire, P. (1970), *Pedagogy of the oppressed*, New York, Continuum.

Freud, S. (1933). New introductory lectures on psychoanalysis Vol. 2, Harmondsworth: Penguin, cited in James, C. (2009), *The Psychodynamics of Educational Change*, Unpublished Paper.

Gadamer, H.G. (1986), *The relevance of the beautiful and other essays*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, cited in Van Manen, M. (1990), *Researching Lived Experience*, New York, State University of New York Press.

Galbraith, J. (1973), *Designing Complex Organizations*, Reading, Mass., Addison-Wesley.

Gardner, W. L. and Martinko, M. J. (1988), Impression management in organizations, *Journal of Management, 14(2),* 321-338.

Gibson, J. (1960), The concept of stimulus in psychology, *American Psychologist*, 15, 694-703, in Michaels, C. and Carello, C. (1979), *Direct perception*, New Jersey, Prentice Hall.

Gibson, J. (1979), The ecological approach to visual perception in Michaels, C. and Carello, C. (1979), *Direct perception*, New Jersey, Prentice Hall.

Giddens, A. (1990), *Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge, Polity.

Glaser, D. and Strauss, A. (1967), discovery of grounded theory cited in Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1998), *Basics of Qualitative Research*, London, Sage.

Goffman, E. (1959), *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Garden City, New York, Doubleday.

Goleman, D. (1998), *Working with Emotional Intelligence*, New York: Bantam Books.

Goleman, D. (2006), *Social Intelligence: The New Science of Social Relationships*, New York, Bantam Books.

Gordon, S.L. (1989), Institutional and impulsive orientations in selectively appropriating emotions to self in: D.D. Franks and E.D. McCarthy (eds.), *The Sociology of Emotions: Original Essays and Research Papers*, 115-135, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Gordon, T., J. Holland, et al., Eds. (2000). Making Spaces: Citizenship and Difference in Schools. Basingstoke, Macmillan, cited in McGregor, J. (2003), Making spaces: teacher workplace topologies, *Pedagogy, Culture and Society,* Volume 11 (3).

Gordon, T., and Lahelma, E., (1996), School is like an ant's nest: spatiality and embodiment in schools, cited in McGregor, J. (2007), Understanding and managing classroom space, *Curriculum Briefing*, Vol. 5 No. 2.

Gough, N. (1997), *Horizons, Images and Experiences: The Research Stories Collection*, Geelong, Vic, Deakin University.

Grandey, A. (2000). Emotion regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(1), 95–110.

Griffith, A. I. (1998), Insider/outsider: epistemological privilege and mothering work, *Human Studies*,21, 361–376 cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Griffiths, G. (1985), Doubts, dilemmas and diary-keeping: some reflections on teacher-based research, in: R. Burgess (Ed.) *Issues in educational research: qualitative methods*, London, The Falmer Press, cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Griffiths, M. (1998), Education research for social justice, Buckingham, Open University Press in Costley, C., Elliot, G. and Gibbs, P. (2010), *Doing work based research: approaches to enquiry for insider-researchers*, London, Sage.

Gross, J. (1998b), The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review, *Review of General Psychology, 2(3),* 271-299.

Gross, J. and John, O. P. (1998), Mapping the domain of expressivity: Multimethod evidence for a hierarchical model, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74(1),* 170-191 in Grandey, A. (2000). Emotion regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(1), 95–110.

Grosz, E. A. (2005), Time travels: feminism, nature and power, Durham, NC, Duke University Press in Thrift, N. (2008), *Non-representational theory: space, politics, affect*, London, Routledge.

Grove, S. J., and Fisk, R. P. (1989). Impression management in services marketing: A

dramaturgical perspective in R. A. Giacalone and P. Rosenfeld (Eds.), *Impression management in the organization* (pp. 427–438). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Grumet, M. R. (1976), Existential and phenomenological foundations cited in Webster, L. and Mertova, P. (2007), *Using Narrative Inquiry as a Research Method*, London, Routledge.

Guattari, F. (2000), *The three ecologies*, London, Athlone Press in Murdoch, J. (2006), *Post-structuralist geography: A guide to relational space*, London, Sage.

Gubrium, J. F. and Holstein, J. A. (1995), *The Active Interview*, Qualitative Research Methods Volume 37, London, Sage.

Gubrium, J.F. and Holstein, J. A. (2009), *Analyzing Narrative Reality*, London, Sage.

Gumbrecht, H. U. (2004), Production of Presence: What meaning cannot convey, Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press, in Thrift, N. (2008), *Non-representational theory: space, politics, affect*, London, Routledge.

Habermas, J. (1987), *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*, Cambridge, Mass, MIT Press.

Hajer, M. A. (1995), *The politics of environmental discourse: ecological modernization and the policy process*, Wotton-under Edge, Clarendon Press in Drake, P. (2011), *Practitioner research at doctoral level: Developing coherent research methodologies*, Oxon, Routledge.

Halton, W. (1994), Some unconscious aspects of organizational life: contributions from psychoanalysis in A. Obholzer, and V. Zagier-Roberts, (eds.), *The Unconscious at Work: Individual and Organizational Stress in the Human Services*, London, Routledge.

Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. (1983), Ethnography, Cambridge, Tavistock, in Drake, P. (2011), *Practitioner research at doctoral level: Developing coherent research methodologies*, Oxon, Routledge.

Hammersley, M. (1993), Educational research: current issues, *Open University study guide: educational research methods E824, Reader 1*, in Drake, P. (2011), *Practitioner research at doctoral level: Developing coherent research methodologies*, Oxon, Routledge.

Hannabus, S. (2000), Being there: ethnographic research and autobiography, *Library Management*, 21(2), 99–106 cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Harding, S. (1991), *Whose Science, Whose Knowledge? Thinking from Women's Lives*, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Harding, J. and Pribram, E. D. (2004), Losing our cool? Following Williams and Grossberg

on emotions, *Cultural Studies*, 18(6), 863–883.

Hargreaves, A. (1999), The psychic rewards (and annoyances) of classroom teaching in: M. Hammersley (ed.) *Researching School Experience: Ethnographic Studies of Teaching and Learning*, (pp 87-106), London and New York, Falmer Press.

Hargreaves, A. (2001), The emotional geographies of teaching, *Teachers College Record*, 103 (6): 1056-80.

Hartley C. and Phelps, E. (2010), Changing fear: the neurocircuitry of emotion regulation, *Journal of Neuropsychopharmacology*, 35(1),136-146.

Harvey, D. (1996), Justice, nature and the geography of difference, Oxford, Blackwell in Murdoch, J. (2006), *Post-structuralist geography: A guide to relational space*, London, Sage.

Hawkins, B. S. R. (1990), The management of staff development in a contracting education service. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, *Birmingham Polytechnic* cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Hayes, N (1998), *Doing Qualitative Analysis in Psychology*, London, Hove Psychology Press.

Heppell, S. (2009), Space the final frontier, introductory video for *SPACE: ADM-HEA Annual Forum*, 29th April – 13th May, Wales Millennium Centre, Cardiff in Boys, J. (2011), *Towards creative learning spaces: rethinking the architecture of post-compulsory education*, London, Routledge.

Higgins, E.T. (1989), Self-discrepancy theory: what patterns of self belief cause people to suffer? *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 22, 93-136.

Hirschhorn, L. (1988), *The Workplace within: Psychodynamics of Organizational Life*, Cambridge, Massachusetts. MIT Press.

Hirschhorn, L. (1990), Leaders and Followers in a Postindustrial Age: A Psychodynamic View, *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 26*(4), 529-543.

Hochschild, A. R. (1979), Emotion work, feeling rules, and social structure. *American Journal of Sociology, 85(3),* 551-575.

Hochschild, A.R. (1983) *The Managed Heart: the commercialization of human feeling, 20th anniversary edition*, reprinted (2003), Berkeley, C.A, University of California Press.

Hochschild, A. (2003), *The Commercialization of Intimate Life: Notes from Home and Work*, LA. University of California Press.

Hockey, J. (1993), Research methods—researching peers and familiar settings, *Research Papers in Education*, 8(2), 199–225 cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Ingold, T. (2006), Rethinking the animate, re-animating thought, *Ethos*, 71, 9 - 20 in Thrift, N. (2008), *Non-representational theory: space, politics, affect*, London, Routledge.

Jacques, E. (1995), Why the psychoanalytic approach to organizations is dysfunctional, *Human Relations*, 48(4): 343-349.

James, C. (2006), A Way of Understanding Schools as Institutions in: C. James, M. Connolly, G. Dunning and T. Elliott (eds.) *How Very Effective Primary Schools Work*, London, Paul Chapman Publishing.

James, C. (2009), *The problematic nature of affect in educational leadership and management research and practice and the case for an affective paradigm*, Unpublished work.

James, C. and Connolly, U. (2000), *Effective Change in Schools*, London, RoutledgeFalmer.

James, W. (1907b), *Pragmatism's conception of truth*, in James (1907a) as cited in Englebretsen, G. (2006), *Bare facts and naked truths: A correspondence theory of truth*, Aldershot, UK, Ashgate.

James, W. (1909), *The meaning of truth*, New York, Longman's Green in Englebretsen, G. (2006), *Bare facts and naked truths: A correspondence theory of truth*, Aldershot, UK, Ashgate.

Jeffrey, B. and Woods, P. (1996), Feeling deprofessionalized; the social construction of emotions during an OFSTED inspection. *Cambridge Journal Of Education*, 126 (3), 235-343.

Jorgensen, B. and Stedman, R. (2001). Sense of place as an attitude: Lakeshore owners' attitudes toward their properties. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 21, 233–248 in Ramkissoon, H., Weiler, B. and Smith, L. (2011), Investigating the Salient Factors of Place Attachment and its Effects on Tourists' Pro-environmental Behavior in National Parks, *16th Graduate Students Research Conference*, 2011, UMassAmherst.

Josephs, I. E., Valsiner, J., and Surgan, S. E. (1999), The process of meaning Construction in J. Brandtstätdter and R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Action and self-development* (257-282), Thousand Oaks, Ca., Sage.

Jovchelovitch, S. (2007), *Knowledge In Context: Representations, Community and Culture*, Hove, Routledge.

Joyce, P. (1994), Democratic subjects: The self and the social nineteenth century England in Rose, N. (1998), *Inventing our selves: psychology, power and personhood*, Cambridge,

Cambridge University Press.

Kagan, J. (2007), *What is Emotion: History, Measures and Meanings*, London, Yale University Press.

Kanuha, V. K. (2000), Being' native versus 'going native; conducting social work research as an insider, *Social Work*, 45(5), 439–447 cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Kaplan, H. and Sadock, B., (1998), *Synopsis of psychiatry*, Eighth Edition, Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins.

Katz, J. (2000), How emotions work, Chicago, University of Chicago Press in Thrift, N. (2008), *Non-representational theory: space, politics, affect*, London, Routledge.

Kelleher, D. and Hillier S. (1996), (Eds) Researching cultural differences in health (London, Routledge) cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Kenneth-Tanner, C. (2000), School design factors for improving student learning cited in McGregor, J. (2003), Making spaces: teacher workplace topologies, *Pedagogy, Culture and Society,* Volume 11 (3).

Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (1991), *Organisations of the couch*, San Francisco: Josey Bass.

Kincheloe, J.L. (2008), *Critical pedagogy primer*, 2nd Ed. New York: Peter Lang.

Kirk, D. (1986), A critical pedagogy for teacher education: Toward an inquiry-oriented approach, *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, Volume 5 (4) 230 – 246

Klein, M. (1959), Our adult world and its roots in infancy, in Colman, A.D. and Geller, M.H. (eds.) *Group Relations Reader 2*, A.K. Rice Institute Series [Washington, D.C] 1985.

Klein, M. and de Riviere, J. (1974), *Love, Hate, and Reparation*, New York, Norton.

Koolhaas, R. Boeri, S. Kwinter, S., Fabricius, D., Obrist, H. U., Tazi, N., (2001), *Mutation,* Bordeaux, Arc en rêve centre d'architecture.

Kostogriz, A. and Peeler, E. (2004), *Professional identity and pedagogical space: Negotiating difference in teacher workplaces*, Paper presented at AARE Conference, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.

Kruml, S. and Geddes, D. (1998, August), Exploring the dimensions of emotional labor: The heart of Hochschild's work, Paper presented at the First Conference of Emotions in

Organizational Life, San Diego, CA. in Grandey, A. (2000). Emotion regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology,* 5(1), 95–110.

Kwinter, S. (2001), Architectures of time: Toward a theory of the event in modernist culture, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press in Thrift, N. (2008), *Non-representational theory: space, politics, affect*, London, Routledge.

Kwon, M. (2004), One place after another: Site specific art and locational identity, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press in Boys, J. (2011), *Towards creative learning spaces: rethinking the architecture of post-compulsory education*, London, Routledge.

Kyle, G., Bricker, K., Graefe, A. and Wickham, T. (2004). An examination of recreationists' relationships with activities and settings, *Leisure Sciences*, 26(2), 123-142.in Ramkissoon, H., Weiler, B. and Smith, L. (2011), Investigating the Salient Factors of Place Attachment and its Effects on Tourists' Pro-environmental Behavior in National Parks, *16th Graduate Students Research Conference*, 2011, UMassAmherst.

Labaree, R. V. (2002), The risk of 'going observationalist': negotiating the hidden dilemmas of being an insider participant observer, *Qualitiative Research*, 2(1), 97–122 cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Lankshear, C., Peters, M., and Knobel, M. (1996), Critical Pedagogy and Cyberspace cited in McGregor, J. (2003), Making spaces: teacher workplace topologies, *Pedagogy, Culture and Society,* Volume 11 (3).

Lather, P. (1993), Fertile obsession: Validity after poststructuralism. *Sociological Quarterly* 34, (4) 673–93cited in Drake, P. (2010), Grasping at methodological understanding: a cautionary tale from insider research *International Journal of Research and Method in Education,* 33: 1, 85 — 99.

Lave, J. (1988), Cognition in practice: mind, mathematics and culture in everyday life, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press in Drake, P. (2011), *Practitioner research at doctoral level: Developing coherent research methodologies*, Oxon, Routledge.

Lawrence, G. (1977), Management development…some ideals, images and realities, in A. D. Colman, and M. H. Geller, (eds.) *Group Relations Reader 2*, A.K. Rice Institute Series [Washington, D.C] 1985.

Lawrence, W. G. (ed.) (2003), *Experiences in Social Dreaming*, London, Karnac.

Lazarus, R. S. (1991). Progress on a cognitive-motivational-relational theory of emotion, *American Psychologist, 46,* 819-834.

Lincoln, Y.S. and Guba, E.G. (1985), *Naturalistic Inquiry*, Beverly Hills, Sage.

Logan, T. (1984) Learning through interviewing, in: J. Schoslak & T. Logan (Eds) *Pupil perspectives,* London, Croom Helm cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Mandler, G. (1975), *Mind and Emotion*, New York, Wiley.

Marcel, G. (1949), *Being and Having, London,* The Dacre Press.

Massey, D. (1991), A global sense of place, *Marxism Today,* June 24- 9 in Murdoch, J. (2006), *Post-structuralist geography: A guide to relational space,* London, Sage.

Massey, D. (1999), Spaces of Politics, in D. Massey, J. Allen and P. Sarre (Eds.) *Human Geography Today,* Cambridge, Polity Press.

Mawson, C. (1994), Containing anxiety in work with damaged children, in A. Obholzer, and V. Zagier-Roberts, (eds.), *The Unconscious at Work: Individual and Organizational Stress in the Human Services,* London, Routledge.

McDowell, L. (1999), *Gender, Identity and Place: understanding feminist geographies,* Cambridge, Polity Press.

McGregor, J. (2003), Making spaces: teacher workplace topologies, *Pedagogy, Culture and Society,* Volume 11 (3).

McGregor, J. (2007), Understanding and managing classroom space, *Curriculum Briefing,* Vol. 5 No. 2.

Measor, L. (1985), Critical incidents in the classroom: identities, choices and careers cited in Webster, L. and Mertova, P. (2007), *Using Narrative Inquiry as a Research Method*, London, Routledge.

Menzies, I. (1975), A case study in the functioning of social systems as a defence against anxiety, *Group Relations Reader,* A. Coleman and W. Bexton, (eds.), California, GREX.

Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Merchant, (2003), Reinventing Eden: the fate of nature in western culture, London, Routledge in Murdoch, J. (2006), *Post-structuralist geography: A guide to relational space*, London, Sage.

Merton, R. (1972), Insiders and outsiders; a chapter in the sociology of knowledge, *American Journal of Sociology,* 78 (July), 9–47 cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate

dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Messick, D. Darley, J., and Tyler T., (2001), Social influences on ethical behaviour in organizations, London, MEA publishers in Costley, C., Elliot, G. and Gibbs, P. (2010), *Doing work based research: approaches to enquiry for insider-researchers*, London, Sage.

Michaels, C. and Carello, C. (1979), *Direct perception*, New Jersey, Prentice Hall.

Migliazzo, A. (2002), *Teaching as an act of faith: Theory and practice in church-related higher education*, USA, Fordham University Press.

Miles, M. B and Huberman, A. M. (1994), Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook, 2nd ed. California, Sage, cited in Shenton, A. (2004), Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects, *Education for Information*, 22, 63–75 63, IOS Press.

Miller, E. J. and Rice, A. K. (1967), *Systems of Organization: The Control of Task and Sentient Boundaries*, London, Tavistock Publications.

Miller, M. G. and Tesser, A. (1992), The role of beliefs and feelings in guiding behaviour: the mismatch model, in L.L. Martin and A. Tesser (Eds.), *The Construction of Social Judgements*, Hillsdale, Erlbaum.

Mishler, E.G. (1990), Validation in inquiry-guided research: the role of exemplars in narrative research, *Harvard Education Review*, 60, 415-460.

Mitchell, J. C. (1983), Case and situational analysis, *Sociological Review*, 31(2), 187-211.

Mitchell, C. (2007b), The art of learning online: engaging students, conference paper presented at *Designs on e-Learning* 12- 14th September, University of the Arts, London in Boys, J. (2011), *Towards creative learning spaces: rethinking the architecture of post-compulsory education*, London, Routledge.

Moore, G. (1953), Some main problems of philosophy, London, Macmillan in Englebretsen, G. (2006), *Bare facts and naked truths: A correspondence theory of truth*, Aldershot, UK, Ashgate.

Morris, J. A. and Feldman, D. C. (1996), The dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of emotional labor, *Academy of Management Review, 21(4),* 986-1010.

Moscovici, S. (1988), Notes towards a description of social representations, *European Journal Of Social Psychology*, 18, 211-250.

Mulligan, K., Simons, P. and Smith, B., (1984) Truthmakers, cited in Newman, A. (2002), *The correspondence theory of truth: An essay on the metaphysics of predication*, Cambridge University Press, New York.

Murdoch, J. (2006), *Post-structuralist geography: A guide to relational space*, London, Sage.

Nespor, J. (2000), Topologies of masculinity: gendered spatialities of preadolescent boys, in N. Lesko (Ed.), *Masculinities at Schools*, Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Nespor, J. (2002), Studying the spatialities of schooling cited in McGregor, J. (2003), Making spaces: teacher workplace topologies, *Pedagogy, Culture and Society,* Volume 11 (3).

Newman, A. (2002), *The correspondence theory of truth: An essay on the metaphysics of predication*, Cambridge University Press, New York.

Norman, D. A. (1988), The psychology of everyday things, New York, Basic Books in Boys, J. (2011), *Towards creative learning spaces: rethinking the architecture of post-compulsory education*, London, Routledge.

Oakley, A. (1981), Interviewing women, in: H. Roberts (Ed.) *Doing feminist research* (London, Routledge and Kegan Paul) cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Oatley, Kyubyshev and Jenkins, J.M. (2003), *Understanding emotions*, Oxford, Blackwell.

Ovisignkina, M. R., (1976), The redemption of interrupted activities in J. de Rivera, (ed.), *Field Theory as Human Science: Contributions Of Lewin's Berlin Group*, New York, Garden Press.

Parkinson, B. (1991), Emotional stylists: strategies of expressive management among trainee hairdressers, *Cognition and Emotion*, 5, 419-434.

Parr, H., Philo, C., and Burns, N., (2005), 'Not a display of emotions': emotional geographies in the scottish highlands, in J. Davidson, L. Bondi and M. Smith, (Eds.), *Emotional Geographies*, Hampshire, UK, Ashgate.

Peet, R. (1998), Modern geographical thought, Oxford, Blackwells in Murdoch, J. (2006), *Post-structuralist geography: A guide to relational space*, London, Sage.

Peirce, C. S. (1931), *Collected Papers*, C. Hartshorne, P. Weiss and A. Burks (eds), Cambridge, MA Harvard University Press, in Englebretsen, G. (2006), *Bare facts and naked truths: A correspondence theory of truth*, Aldershot, UK, Ashgate.

Perrow, C. (1984), *The Normal Accident*, New York, Basic Books.

Philo, C and Parr, H. (2000), Editorial. Institutional Geographies: Introductory remarks, Geoforum, 31, 513-521 cited in McGregor, J. (2003), Making spaces: teacher workplace topologies, *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, Volume 11 (3).

Platt, J. (1981), On interviewing one's peers, *The British Journal of Sociology*, 32(1), 75–91 cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Pollard, A. (1985), Opportunities and difficulties of a teacher-ethnographer: a personal account, in: R. Burgess (Ed.) *Field methods in the study of education*, Lewes, Falmer Press cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1995), Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis in Hatch, J. Amos and Wisniewski, R. (eds.) *Life History and Narrative*, Oxon, RoutledgeFalmer.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (2005), Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative research, *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 2005, Vol. 52, No. 2, 137–145.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1998), *Struggling for the Soul: the Politics of Schooling and the Construction of the Teacher*, New York, Teachers College Press.

Powney, J. and Watts, M. (1987), Interviewing in educational research, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Proshansky, H. M., Fabian, A. K., and Kaminoff, R. (1983), Place identity: Physical world socialization of the self, *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 3, 57-83.

Rafaeli, A. and Sutton, R. I. (1989), The expression of emotion in organizational life in L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 11, pp. 1–42). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Ricoeur, P. (1992), Oneself as Another (K. Blamey, trans.), Chicago, Chicago University Press (Original work published in 1990) in Polkinghorne, D. E. (1995), Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis in Hatch, J. Amos and Wisniewski, R. (eds.) *Life History and Narrative*, Oxon, RoutledgeFalmer.

Roberts, V. Z. (1994), The organization of work: Contributions from open systems theory, in A. Obholzer, and V. Zagier-Roberts, (eds.), *The Unconscious at Work: Individual and Organizational Stress in the Human Services*, London, Routledge.

Roizen, J. and Jepson, M. (1985), *Degrees for Jobs: Employers expectations of Higher Education*, Windsor, SRHE/NFER–Nelson.

Rosenthal, R. and Rosnow, R.L. (1969), *Artifact in Behavioural Research*, New York, Academic Press.

Rose, N. (1998), *Inventing our selves: psychology, power and personhood*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Satyamurti, C. (1981), *Occupational Survival*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Scherer, K. R., (2004), Feelings integrate the central representation of appraisal driven response organization in emotion, in A.S.R. Manstead, N. Frijda and A. Fischer (Eds.), *Feelings and Emotions*, New York, Cambridge University Press.

Schneider, B. and Bowen, D. E. (1985), Employee and customer perceptions of service in banks: Replication and extension, *Journal of Applied Psychology, 70,* 423-433.

Schulz, A. (1971), The stranger: an essay in social psychology, in: B. R. Cosin, I. R. Dale, G. M. Esland and D. F. Swift (Eds) *School and society,* London, Routledge and Kegan Paul in association with The Open University Press cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Scott, S. (1985) Working through the contradictions in researching postgraduate education, in: R. Burgess (Ed.) *Field methods in the study of education,* Lewes, Falmer Press cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Scott, D., Brown, A., Lunt, I., and Thorne, I. (2004), Professional doctorates: integrating professional and academic knowledge, in Drake, P. (2011), *Practitioner research at doctoral level: Developing coherent research methodologies*, Oxon, Routledge.

Shah, S. (2004), The researcher/interviewer in intercultural context: a social intruder! *British Educational Research Journal*, 30(4), 549–575 cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Shaw, R. and Bransford, J. (1977), Introduction: psychological approaches to the problem of knowledge. In R.E. Shaw and J. Bransford (Eds.), *Perceiving, Acting and Knowing*, Hillsdale, N.J.; Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, in Michaels, C. and Carello, C. (1979), *Direct perception*, New Jersey, Prentice Hall.

Shaw, R. and McIntyre, M. (1974), Algoristic foundations to cognitive psychology, in W. Weimer and D. Palermo (Eds.), *Cognition and the Symbolic Processes*, Hillsdale, N.J.; Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, in Michaels, C. and Carello, C. (1979), *Direct perception*, New Jersey, Prentice Hall.

Shaw, R. E., Turvey, M. T. and Mace, W. M. (1982), Ecological psychology: The consequence of a commitment to realism, in W. Weimer and D. Palermo (Eds.), *Cognition and the Symbolic Processes*, 2, 159 – 226, Hillsdale, N.J.; Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Shilling, C. (1991), Social Space, Gender Inequalities and Educational Differentiation, *British Journal of Sociology and Education*, 12 (1), 23-24.

Shotter, J. (1985), Social accountability and self specification in Rose, N. (1998), *Inventing our selves: psychology, power and personhood*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Silverman, D. (2000), Doing qualitative research: a practical handbook, London, Sage cited in Mercer, J. (2006), The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double edged sword and resolving delicate dilemmas, *Oxford Review of Education*, 33 (1).

Sizer, T. (1992), *Horace's school: Redesigning the American High School,* Boston, Houghlin Mifflin Co.

Snyder, M. (1974), Self–monitoring of expressive behavior, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30(4),* 526–537.

Sokal, A. and Bricmont, J. (1999), *Intellectual Impostures*, London, Profile Books.

Solnit, R. (2000), Wanderlust: A history of walking, London, Viking in Thrift, N. (2008), *Non-representational theory: space, politics, affect*, London, Routledge.

Steiner, C. (1997) *Achieving Emotional Literacy*, London, Bloomsbury.

Stenhouse, L. (1985), A note on case study and educational practice in R. G. Burgess (ed.), *Field Methods in the Study of Education*, Lewes, Falmer Press.

Stenross, B and Kleinmann, S. (1989), The highs and lows of emotional labour: detectives encounters with criminals and victims, *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 17 (4), 435-452.

Stokes, J. (1994), The unconscious at work in groups and teams: Contributions from the work of Wilfred Bion, in A. Obholzer, and V. Zagier-Roberts, (eds.), *The Unconscious at Work: Individual and Organizational Stress in the Human Services*, London, Routledge.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1998), *Basics of Qualitative Research,* London: Sage.

Strawson, P. F. (1949), Truth, in Newman, A. (2002), *The correspondence theory of truth: An essay on the metaphysics of predication*, Cambridge University Press, New York.

Thoits, P.A. (1991), On merging identity theory and stress research, *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 54, 101-112.

Thrift, N. and Dewsbury, J. D. (2000), Dead geographies – and how to make them live, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 18, 411 - 432 in Murdoch, J. (2006), *Post-structuralist geography: A guide to relational space*, London, Sage.

Thrift, N. (1996), Spatial Formations, London, Sage in Murdoch, J. (2006), *Post-structuralist*

geography: A guide to relational space, London, Sage.

Thrift, N. (1999), Steps to an ecology of place, in D. Massey, J. Allen and P. Sarre (eds), *Human geography today*, Cambridge, Polity Press in Murdoch, J. (2006), *Post-structuralist geography: A guide to relational space*, London, Sage.

Thrift, N. (2008), *Non-representational theory: space, politics, affect*, London, Routledge.

Timmers, M., Fischer, A. H. and Manstead, A. S. R. (1998), Gender motives for regulating emotions, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24(9),* 974-985 in Grandey, A. (2000). Emotion regulation in the workplace: A new way to conceptualize emotional labor, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology,* 5(1), 95–110.

Trilling, L. (1972), Sincerity and authenticity in Hochschild, A.R. (1983), *The Managed Heart: the commercialization of human feeling.* Berkeley, C.A, University of California Press.

Tschumi, B. (1994), The Manhattan transcripts (2nd edition), in Boys, J. (2011), *Towards creative learning spaces: rethinking the architecture of post-compulsory education*, London, Routledge.

Tuan, Y. (1977), *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN.

Tuckett A., and Stewart D. (2004a), Collecting qualitative data: Part II Group discussion as a method: experience, rationale, limitations, *Contemporary Nurse,* 16 (3), 240-251.

Turner, J. H. (1999), Toward a general sociological theory of emotions *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 29, 2, 133-161(15).

Turquet, P. (1974), Leadership: the individual and the group in A. D. Colman, and M.H. Geller, (eds.) *Group Relations Reader 2,* A.K. Rice Institute Series [Washington, D.C] 1985.

Turvey, M. and Shaw, R. (1979), The primacy of perceiving: an ecological reformulation of perception for understanding memory. In L. G. Nilsson (Ed), *Perspectives on Memory Research: Essays in Honor of Uppsala University's 500th Anniversary*, Hillsdale, N.J.; Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, in Michaels, C. and Carello, C. (1979), *Direct perception*, New Jersey, Prentice Hall.

Urry, J. (2000), Sociologies beyond societies, London, Routledge in Thrift, N. (2008), *Non-representational theory: space, politics, affect*, London, Routledge.

Urry, J. (2005), The place of emotions within place, in J. Davidson, L. Bondi and M. Smith, (Eds.), *Emotional Geographies*, Hampshire, UK, Ashgate.

Usher, R. (2000), Imposing structure: enabling play – new knowledge production in the real world university in Drake, P. (2011), *Practitioner research at doctoral level: Developing*

coherent research methodologies, Oxon, Routledge.

Van Maanen, J. and Kunda, G. (1989), 'Real feelings': emotional expression and organizational culture in L.L. Cummings and B. M. Staw (eds.), *Research in organizational behaviour*, vol 11: 43-103, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Van Manen, M. (1990), *Researching Lived Experience: Human Science for an Action Sensitive Pedagogy*, New York, State University of New York Press.

Valsiner, J. (2000), *Culture and human development*, London, Sage.

Valsiner, J. (2003), Beyond social representations: a theory of enablement, *Papers on Social Representations*, (12) 7.1-7.16.

Valsiner, J. (2005), Civility of Basic Distrust: A cultural-psychological view on persons-in-society, Paper presented at the Symposium Risk, Trust, and Civility Toronto, Victoria College—July, 4, 2005.

von Neumann, J. (1966), Theory of self reproducing automata. A. W. Burks (Ed), Urbana, III: University of Illinois Press in Michaels, C. and Carello, C. (1979), *Direct perception*, New Jersey, Prentice Hall.

Weber, M. (1963), Objectivity in Social Science and Social Policy, cited in Hochschild, A. (2003), *The Commercialization of Intimate Life: Notes from Home and Work*, LA. University of California Press.

Webster, L. and Mertova, P. (2007), *Using Narrative Inquiry as a Research Method*, London, Routledge.

Weiss, H. M. and Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: a theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences or affective experiences at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 18: 1-74.

Wellington, J. (2000), *Educational Research: Contemporary Issues and Practical Approaches*, London, Continuum.

West, C. (1996), Ethnography and orthography: a modest methodological proposal, cited in Gubrium, J.F. and Holstein, J. A. (2009), *Analyzing Narrative Reality*, London, Sage.

Wharton, A. S. and Erickson, R. J. (1993), Managing emotions on the job and at home: Understanding the consequences of multiple emotional roles, *Academy of Management Review, 18(3)*, 457-486.

Whatmore, S. (2002), Hybrid geographies: Natures, cultures, spaces, London, Sage in Murdoch, J. (2006), *Post-structuralist geography: A guide to relational space*, London, Sage.

Willis, P. (1980), Notes on method in Culture, Media, Language, S. Hall et al (ed), London, Hutchinson in Lather, P. (1991), *Getting Smart: Feminist Research and Pedagogy with/in the Postmodern*, New York, Routledge.

Williams, D., Anderson, B., McDonald, C. and Patterson, M. (1995), Measuring place attachment, *Outdoor Recreation Planning and Management Research Session 1995 NRPA Leisure Research Symposium*, San Antonio, Texas

Wittgenstein, L. (1953), *Philosophical Investigations*, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing.

Wittgenstein, L. (1971), Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus, D. F. Pears and B. F. McGuiness, (trans) cited in Newman, A. (2002), *The correspondence theory of truth: An essay on the metaphysics of predication*, Cambridge University Press, New York.

Wolcott, H. F. (1995), *The Art of Fieldwork*, London, Sage.

Woods, P. (1993a), *Critical Events in Teaching and Learning, Basingstoke*, Falmer Press.

Wortham, S. (2008), Linguistic anthropology of education, *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 37 (3), 3.1 – 3.15.

Yin, R. K. (1994), Case Study Research: Design and Methods, California, Sage.

Younge, G. (2001), Space Rage, Guardian, 9th January cited in McGregor, J. (2003), Making spaces: teacher workplace topologies, *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, Volume 11 (3).

Zajonc, R. (1980), Feeling and thinking: preferences need no inferences, *American Psychologist*, 35, 151-175.

Zembylas, M. and Vrasidas, C. (2004), Emotion, reason, and information and communication technologies in education: some issues in a post-emotional society. *E-Learning*, 1(1), 105–127.

Zorn, D. and Boler, M. (2007), Rethinking emotions and educational leadership, *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 10, No. 2, 137–151.